

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, January 19, 1917.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Hasten the day, O Lord God Almighty, when men of all conditions and circumstances of life shall strive to live to the highest condition of ethics as woven into the soul, iterated and reiterated in the Book of books, amplified by the great philosophers, seers, and religious teachers of all the ages; that by the rectitude of our behavior Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the committee to attend the funeral of Admiral Dewey.

The Clerk read the names, as follows:

Mr. PADGETT, Mr. TALBOTT, Mr. ESTOPINAL, Mr. RIORDAN, Mr. HENSLEY, Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois, Mr. GRAY of Indiana, Mr. CALLAWAY, Mr. CONNELLY, Mr. HART, Mr. OLIVER, Mr. LIEBEL, Mr. VENABLE, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts, Mr. BROWNING, Mr. FARR, Mr. BRITTON, Mr. KELLEY, Mr. MUDD, Mr. LOUD, Mr. DALE of Vermont, Mr. GREENE of Vermont, Mr. FOSS, and Mr. KETTNER.

## ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill and joint resolutions of the following titles:

S. 5718. An act to provide for auxiliary reclamation project in connection with the Yuma project, Arizona;

S. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to issue temporary permits for additional diversions of water from the Niagara River; and

S. J. Res. 194. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy which will occur March 1, 1917, in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of decorations conferred upon American Army and Navy officers by foreign governments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of decorations granted to the officers of the American Army and Navy by foreign kings, emperors, princes, and potentates. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## SAMUEL UNTERMYER.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, this morning Mr. Samuel Untermyer, of New York, called me by telephone from the Johns Hopkins Hospital at Baltimore, where he is at present, and requested me to present to the House a telegram which he had sent to me last night. Mr. Untermyer is ill, and is leaving to-day for Palm Beach for a two months' stay; and in view of the fact that his name was mentioned in a critical manner in the discussion of the employment of counsel for the so-called "leak" investigation, he is anxious to have a statement made which explains his position. I ask to have read the telegram he has sent me.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the telegram will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BALTIMORE, Md., January 18, 1917.

Hon. JOHN J. FITZGERALD,  
Chairman House Committee on Appropriations,  
Washington, D. C.:

This bandying around of my name on the floor of the House as though I had been seeking a job is no less, and perhaps more, of an outrage than the dastardly action of dragging in the names of public men in the mire on the authority of short-selling gamblers and Wall Street gutter rumor.

Congressmen have immunity from punishment, and have public responsibility; their words carry corresponding weight.

I did not want the place. Nobody ever suggested that I take it, and would not have accepted it except at great risk. Apart from all other considerations I have been and am still ill, and am leaving the hospital here to-morrow for Palm Beach for a two months' stay upon peremptory instructions of my physicians, pursuant to long-since-made arrangements.

I am anxious to see a thorough investigation for the sakes of those who may be proven to have been cruelly libeled. They are helpless

against villification that cripples the public usefulness for which they make great sacrifices. That is the sort of thing that drives men out of public life in disgust.

I have just learned of the use that has been made of my name, and will feel indebted to you if in justice to me you will set the matter right for me before the House and the country in return for the effort to reform a public service, at great personal sacrifice, in championing the regulations of the stock exchange so that it will be a legitimate security market, which I believe to be one of our most urgent needs. I have been persistently misrepresented and maligned by their far-reaching press bureau for five years. They have been pursuing me, but I did not expect Members of Congress to swallow their inspired libels. I could have no purpose other than the public welfare, since I have in my life never bought stocks on margin or engaged in any form of speculative transactions. If I had, they would be bound to know of it. My Bethlehem stock has been owned by me for over 10 years.

SAMUEL UNTERMYER.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, as there may be further discussion of various phases of this matter, I hope that this statement of Mr. Untermyer will permit his name to pass into oblivion so far as this matter is concerned.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, may I make inquiry of the gentleman?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Is that view which the gentleman has no doubt properly expressed based on the calumny that Mr. Untermyer saw fit to cast upon Members of Congress? Is it due to the comment in the message that the latter makes respecting Members of Congress and their conception of public duty?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, I do not think that Members of Congress are absolutely innocent of gullability.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I do not think so either, but I do not think that the language the gentleman has used in there is either parliamentary or decent.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, Mr. Untermyer was criticized very severely from his standpoint without any apparent justification.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. He was no stranger to Congress. We had observed his conduct of a very important investigation within the memory of many of us, probably all of us. If we saw fit to make some comment on it, I do not think that justifies him in sending an insult to Congress.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not think it is an insult.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Does not the gentleman think that the language incorporated is an insult?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think that if a private citizen without apparent reason is abused on the floor of the House because of his supposititious selection for some public service he has at least the right to make it clear that he did not seek the service, that it had not been suggested to him, and that in his present physical condition probably could not have accepted it if it had been offered.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I think that may be true, but—

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think when men go out of their way to throw bricks at private citizens who have rendered distinguished public service, those private citizens may be entitled to return the bricks.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. As to that statement, there is some doubt in the minds of some as to the value of the distinguished public service he has rendered.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, men may doubt the value of the services which the gentleman from Minnesota and myself have rendered.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I think the gentleman is correct, at least as to the latter part of it. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. If I were writing the message, I might not use the same language, but I probably would have been a little more vehement in expressing my indignation if I had been discussed on the floor as Mr. Untermyer was.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Oh, as to that, the gentleman never will be. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. To ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Reserving the right to object, is this to be an attack on Mr. Untermyer?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It has reference to the letter which has just been read.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the gentleman intend to talk about Mr. Untermyer?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This is not a filibuster. I desire to comment upon the letter that has just been read, which was read to be placed in the RECORD.



Mr. FOSTER. Unless we are going into a discussion of this matter, I do not think it is necessary—

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Just a moment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that I was one of the Members of Congress who mentioned the name of Mr. Untermeyer, and Mr. Untermeyer's letter unquestionably reflects upon those Members of Congress who mentioned his name. I have no unkindly feeling toward Mr. Untermeyer, but I think I ought to state why his name was mentioned, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. FOSTER. If there is to be an attack upon Mr. Untermeyer this morning, there may be some one here who will desire to defend him. He has some rights—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Untermeyer's rights have been asserted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FOSTER. There may be some one who will want to defend Mr. Untermeyer. I think myself he is a very clean citizen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there are a great many men in this country, men of prominence and some editorial writers, who take very great liberties with this House. They seem to assume that they can make a joke of Congress whenever they see fit. I believe in the dignity of the House, but I am aware that every man who is capable of writing a college essay and desires to do so is permitted to scatter broadcast reflections upon the honor and the dignity of the people's representatives, and that it creates a false impression of the Representatives here.

Samuel Untermeyer, in this letter, has indicated that some Members of Congress have taken advantage of their privilege. Perhaps I was one to whom he referred. I have no interest in the world in Mr. Untermeyer, and no desire to check him in any laudable and proper ambition; but I read in a newspaper a few days ago that Thomas Lawson, who has caused Congress a great deal of trouble and much humiliation, had suggested that he wanted the whole stock business of the country investigated, and wanted Mr. Samuel Untermeyer engaged as the attorney to make that investigation. Now, I recollected that Mr. Untermeyer was employed by Congress sometime ago as the people's representative to investigate the so-called Money Trust, and that he was engaged because he was supposed to have a heart that was bleeding for the downtrodden. I heard at that time that Mr. Untermeyer was the representative of great corporations, and I questioned the wisdom of his selection as a representative of the people to investigate the corporations. When Mr. Lawson, the last man in the world to make the suggestion, proposed that Mr. Untermeyer should be employed in this crisis to defend the honor of Congress, I questioned whether he was the proper man for the place, and made the suggestion that someone else should be selected. Now, Mr. Untermeyer's record is in "Who's Who." If you want to know about great corporations go get that book and read what Mr. Untermeyer has done in the way of erecting great corporations in this country, and then you will understand why I for one believe that he is the last person who should be considered, especially upon the recommendation of Mr. Lawson, to investigate any great combination or capitalistic interest, as the representative of the plain people of the United States.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZGERALD. In view of the fact that the gentleman has gotten so excited—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am not excited. I am emphatic—

Mr. FITZGERALD. In view of the fact that the gentleman has gotten so excited about the statements of Mr. Lawson, does he not think there is some justification for Mr. Untermeyer's statement about Congressmen's capacity to swallow?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I did not catch what the gentleman said, and it makes very little difference. The gentleman has put in the RECORD a letter written by a man who assumed that Congress had said something about him. That letter refers to Bethlehem steel stock, which Mr. Untermeyer says he holds and which is doubtless the cause of his grievance. There was absolutely nothing said upon this floor about Bethlehem steel stock when the Lawson matter was discussed. The gentleman is shooting off about Members of Congress without warrant, and I resent it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

#### ADVERTISEMENTS OF ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes, not on the subject which has just been discussed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. RANDALL] asks unanimous consent to proceed for not to exceed three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. In the time granted to me, Mr. Speaker, I ask to have read at the Clerk's desk a copy of a letter from the Olympia (Wash.) Building & Loan Association, addressed to one Mr. Henry S. Rosenthal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be read in the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

OLYMPIA BUILDING & LOAN ASSOCIATION,  
Olympia, Wash., January 12, 1917.

MR. HENRY S. ROSENTHAL,  
Care of American Building Association News,  
15 West Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

DEAR MR. ROSENTHAL: I am very much surprised to receive a bunch of booze literature with your name attached to it and inclosing an appeal to us to protest against the enactment of a bill introduced by Mr. RANDALL, of California in the National Congress to prohibit advertisements of the liquor business, and in the same connection a bill by Mr. BANKHEAD to exclude liquor advertisements from the mails.

I shall not only not protest against the enactment of these bills, but since you have brought the matter to my attention I will write to our Representatives in Washington, D. C., and urge their cooperation in passing both of these bills. It is more than I can comprehend that anyone connected with the building and loan business would take an active participation in the propaganda of the booze crowd, especially a man in your high position in the building and loan movement and living as you do in Cincinnati where, if anywhere, a man can see the atrocity of the liquor business in all its forms.

The motto of the building and loan movement, as you know, is "The American home, the safeguard of American liberties." I have never yet heard of even a most pronounced liquor advocate indorsing the saloon as the friend of the American home. I don't see how you can be in both of these movements and be overburdened with consistency. It seems to me it is time for all building and loan men, above all others, to detach themselves from any complicity in the perpetuation of the liquor business. In this State we have outlawed the saloon and it is only a question of time when the importation into the State of any liquor except for strictly mechanical and medicinal purposes will be a felony.

As you undoubtedly have sent this stuff to all the building and loan associations of this State, I may take the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to all associations. I have in times past received other printed matter of the kind you now send me and I regret therefore to connect you with it. Please take our name from your booze mailing list at once. We are not interested in such propaganda.

Very truly, yours,

WALTER F. McDOWELL,  
Secretary.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for its courtesy in yielding me the time to have this letter read.

#### THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE TRIBBLE.

Mr. RUCKER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Sunday, February 4, 1917, be set apart for addresses upon the life, character, and public services of Hon. SAMUEL J. TRIBBLE, late a Representative from the State of Georgia.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the order will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

#### PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Under the rule heretofore adopted, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 18994) to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings; to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings; to authorize the erection and completion of certain public buildings; to authorize the purchase of sites for certain public buildings; to abolish the Office of Supervising Architect of the Treasury and to create and organize in the Treasury Department a bureau of public buildings and define its duties, powers, and jurisdiction; to create and establish the office of commissioner of public buildings; to fix the salary and prescribe the duties and powers of the said commissioner of public buildings; to create a board of estimates and prescribe its duties and powers; to provide for the standardization of certain classes of public buildings, and for other purposes, with Mr. CLINE in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office, at Havana, Ill., \$40,000.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section. This seems to be a post office the bill for which was introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY]. I heard his very eloquent speech several days ago regarding economy, and the fact that the gentleman opposes any large appropriation at



this session, I hope, will induce him to agree to my amendment and that it will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 12, by striking out line 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was considered, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Huntingdon, Tenn., \$25,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the item.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 12, by striking out lines 9 and 10.

Mr. FREAR. I move to strike out the paragraph. Mr. Chairman, the only data that I shall submit on that item are that which has been furnished in regard to these and all other items which are subject to the same objection. Before I do that I wish to make one suggestion that we are entitled to make, and that is that there is no disposition to obstruct ordinary legislation or take up unnecessary time.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to say that we are perfectly satisfied to meet gentlemen on that basis; that there is no disposition on our side to shut off any legitimate discussion. If gentlemen will confine themselves to what is legitimate—and I want to say that the gentleman from Wisconsin has done that, although some others have not—if they will do that, there will be no objection.

Mr. FREAR. I will say that there are only a limited number of items which I intend to discuss and on which I base my objection. Yesterday we spent an hour in discussing a \$300 item for a clerkship or work for the Military Committee, and yet we passed between five and seven million dollars appropriated for 50 or more public buildings with less than three hours' discussion. I submit it is only fair for us to have an understanding of what is contained in the bill. There are a few suggestions I wish to make concerning this particular item. This item refers to Huntingdon, Tenn. The population in 1910, according to statistics before me, was 1,112. The postal receipts for 1915 were \$4,427. The estimated cost to the Government for carrying on or maintaining the building is \$3,300 per annum.

There is a suggestion that comes to us from the public commission report in regard to these buildings which I want to read briefly, because it has a direct bearing on the item of cost of maintenance. I am reading from Mr. Allen's report, contained in the Public Building Commission report, page 53, in which it is said:

But the adoption of the policy of erecting buildings whenever post-office receipts reached \$10,000 would further obligate the Government to the extent of the yearly increase in offices of this character, conservatively estimated at 542 from June 30, 1913, to January 1, 1920. There would then be 508 buildings and the increase of 542 to be erected, in all, 1,050. At \$100,000 each these would cost \$105,111,000 and their operation based on the average heretofore employed would be \$2,612,158. This would be a total estimated operating charge per year of \$9,542,988 for all such buildings. Three per cent interest on this investment would be \$3,150,000.

The average rental for the 508 post offices is \$822, and their total rental cost to the Government at this time \$417,768.

There are 333 buildings from a total of 436 occupied for post offices only in commission November 1, 1913, erected for less than \$100,000.

Only 72 of the 266 post offices and courthouses and customhouses in commission November 1, 1913, cost less than \$100,000.

Four hundred and five of 702 buildings in commission November 1, 1913, were constructed for less than \$100,000, and 297 were constructed at \$100,000 or more.

There are 114 new buildings and 155 sites and buildings in the act of March 4, 1918, for which appropriations of \$100,000 or less than that amount have been provided.

Forty-five of the projects not classed as special have appropriations of \$100,000 or in excess of that amount.

It is estimated from figures of cost kept by the Supervising Architect's Office that the average cost of operation, including only janitor force, fuel, lights, water, and miscellaneous supplies for the kind of buildings now being constructed, the cost of which is approximately \$50,000, is \$1,815 per year; \$75,000 is \$2,320 per year; \$100,000 is \$3,789 per year. It will be noted that this estimate is based upon buildings as they are now constructed and differ from the average operating cost being paid for the 702 buildings in commission on November 1, 1913.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I do not ask any gentleman to vote for this bill on my account. I have been serving in this House 20 years on the 4th of next March. There has never been but one public building built in my district within that time and that cost \$40,000.

Now, the town of Huntingdon is in Carroll County, Tenn. Carroll County is one of the most reliable Republican counties in my State, and even this city of Huntingdon is a Republican

city. Seven nominees of the opposition parties that have run against me in the 20 years that I have been in Congress were from Carroll County; both the first and last one were from Carroll County. I succeeded the Hon. John E. McCall, who was a Republican Member of the Fifty-fourth Congress. He was a citizen and native of this town. He is now an honored and distinguished district judge of the United States court for the western district of Tennessee.

But there is a matter of sentiment in this matter. But before coming to that I will state about the receipts. The receipts for the last quarter of last year as reported by the chairman of the committee were \$1,580. If that rate of increase continues the receipts will soon amount to \$10,000.

A site had been acquired and it took two bills to do it. The first amount appropriated was \$2,500, but for that price we could not get a corner site. And then there was an additional bill authorizing it to be built in the middle of the square and not on a corner of the public square.

This town was the home town of my beloved and deceased friend, James C. Courts, clerk of the Committee on Appropriations, who came into the public service of this House 39 years ago. I did not introduce the bill on my own suggestion, because there are other towns in my district—there are Democratic towns—where buildings are needed. Mr. Courts's brother-in-law, who was then and now is mayor of the city, a staunch Republican, asked and begged me to do this, and I did it; and I will stand by it to the last. Mr. Courts has saved to this Government, by way of an economic and efficient service, a sum far greater than any individual Member in this House or at the other end of this Capitol has ever saved it. This is a memorial to a man who advised the great Committee on Appropriations as its clerk and who assisted that great committee in its conferences with the Senate. I appeal to you to waive your arbitrary, technical requirements as to the question of receipts and construct this building. I made what was in the nature of a personal sacrifice in this matter, because I was appealed to by others where the towns had more receipts and that were Democratic cities; but I wanted the flag to fly over the town in which James C. Courts lived and remained a citizen until his death. I do not care whether it is economical or not, whether it will cost more or less than the present receipts of the office. There is not a public building in the United States to-day that could not be run under private management for less than the maintenance and operation of it by the Government, even this Capitol Building. I feel it is nothing but justice to myself that I should say this much in explaining this paragraph in the bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to strike out the paragraph.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Lancaster, Pa., \$250,000.

Mr. GRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 12, line 18, insert, after the words "post office," the following: "headquarters for the internal-revenue district and for other Government offices."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a telegram from the postmaster of Lancaster, Pa., stating that the postal receipts in that office for the fiscal year ending June 30 last were \$200,116, and that for the calendar year ending December 31, 1916, the receipts were \$203,600.

I also am in receipt of a telegram from the collector of internal revenue, whose headquarters are in the Lancaster building, to the effect that the receipts for the fiscal year ending June 30 last were \$3,605,103.35.

I do not believe that there is any other rural community in the United States that can show revenue and postal receipts exceeding in aggregate the amounts which I have mentioned.

The present building in which these governmental activities are housed was provided for by the Congress about the year 1886, at which time the postal receipts were only \$32,974.69 and revenue receipts were \$1,448,629.94 annually, and unfortunately the building was constructed for the business of the moment and not with a view to the marvelous development of the future. To-day six times as much postal business is transacted in this building as was contemplated when it was constructed,



the receipts of the internal-revenue business have almost trebled, and many other governmental activities now seek quarters in this building. In proportion almost to the increase in business has the building become inadequate and insufficient in floor space and in arrangement. Being convinced of that fact and being advised by the Supervising Architect of the Treasury that an enlargement of the present building was not practicable, the Congress in 1913 authorized the purchase of a site for a new building, and now in the pending measure an appropriation of \$250,000 is asked that the erection of the building may be proceeded with.

Not alone from the viewpoint of exceptionally large revenue and postal receipts should a Federal building adequate for all governmental purposes be erected in Lancaster. There are also historical and other reasons why a building of memorial design and monumental proportions should be provided. In this colonial town, then the largest inland town in all the Colonies, the Continental Congress held a sitting, making Lancaster for the time the Capital of the Colonies. For many years, also, Lancaster was the capital of the Keystone State. The mortal remains of a signer of the Declaration of Independence are buried here, as are those of the adjutant general of the Revolutionary forces. Here lived and died a President of the United States, who, as one of my predecessors, sat in this House during a period of 10 years, and subsequently, prior to his election to the Presidency, represented this country as ambassador to England and as Secretary of State. The great commoner, Thaddeus Stevens, who devoted his life to the destruction of the slave traffic and the preservation of the Union, and who was the acknowledged leader and master of the House during the stormy days of the Civil War, lies buried in an honored grave in Lancaster, where most of his life was lived. There, too, were spent the boyhood days of Robert Fulton, the inventor of the steamboat, to whom, if to any inventive genius, the Government of the United States owes a memorial, as does the whole wide world.

It is apparent, therefore, that while there are business reasons in an extraordinary degree for the passage of this appropriation, there is history and sentiment that can well be commemorated, without additional cost to the Government, in the design and character of the structure contemplated.

I shall not burden the RECORD nor consume the time of the House with the statistics, official documents, and other matters that convinced the committee of the meritorious character of this proposition. This evidence is in the files of the Public Buildings Committee and is accessible if needed. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office and other Government offices at Lenoir, N. C., \$30,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 12, by striking out lines 22 and 23.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I do not know the names of the Representatives who are responsible for these various items, and I regret if I step on anyone's toes. I did not know that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS], with whom I was discussing this bill yesterday, was responsible for the item he has just been talking about. I did not know that it was his personal item. But these are not personal items. They are items that concern the Government of the United States and the Treasury at this particular time, and all of these items, according to the Treasury Department report, under which we are proceeding now, with rare exceptions, are open to the same objection of inexcusable waste.

This is an item for a United States post office and other Government offices at Lenoir, N. C., and the amount authorized is \$30,000. There are 11 Federal courthouses to-day in the State of North Carolina. There are as many Federal courthouses in that one State of North Carolina as in the State of Illinois and the State of Ohio combined. This item provides for other Government offices at Lenoir. I do not know whether it is for a courthouse or not, but I want to suggest something which comes from this report of the public-buildings commission which seems to have a direct bearing on this item and others of similar character.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman admits that the receipts of this office are beyond \$10,000?

Mr. FREAR. Oh, yes; according to the report. But that has nothing to do with it, as I view it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to state to the gentleman that this is not an effort to provide a courthouse, but it is an internal-revenue and civil-service office.

Mr. FREAR. The population of this town is 3,364, and the post-office receipts annually amounted to \$9,827, while the rent paid is \$840 a year. It is proposed to take over, according to the Treasury estimates, a maintenance charge of \$5,000 a year, which is over 500 per cent greater than the Government pays at present.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman get me a little extra time?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I want to ask the gentleman what he thinks the postal receipts ought to be in order to have a Government building, and also what he thinks the population of the town ought to be?

Mr. FREAR. I am very glad to answer the gentleman.

Let me say, first, that those who have given study to this subject, and I do not pretend to be an expert, and do not want to be placed in that rôle-taking, for instance, Mr. Burleson. He says that the rent of every proposed city post office should be \$1,000 a year, and there should be 5,000 inhabitants before a building is constructed. That is the same statement that the gentleman who sits in the chair, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRANE], put into his committee report. I do not pretend to have better judgment than such gentlemen. Speaking for myself, I say that where we are paying \$800 a year rent, and are asked by this bill to undertake a charge of \$5,000 a year for maintenance, there can be no justification for the Government undertaking the additional expense. That will be five or six or seven hundred per cent more than we are paying now. Before authorizing a new building I think comparative costs ought to be approximately the same. That is the business way of locating such buildings.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let the gentleman give me his figures on population and postal receipts.

Mr. FREAR. I am giving the reports. I do not pretend to be an expert.

Mr. AUSTIN. But I have asked the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. FREAR. I can not give any opinion without a specific case is presented. These gentlemen in the Treasury Department and in the Post Office Department have given opinions. As a lawyer, I would not assume to give you the law, according to my own convictions, but I would give you the law as set down by precedents and by whose judgment would be accepted. I state what the Treasury Department says the comparative cost is going to be. That statement speaks for itself.

Mr. AUSTIN. But the gentleman is criticizing the members of our committee for bringing this report in. Now, what is his judgment?

Mr. FREAR. I am giving the gentleman the best opinion I can possibly obtain. It is immaterial what my judgment may be. I have said positively and frequently that, in my judgment, the increase should not be excessive, as a good business proposition, probably none at all. The maintenance charge should be approximately the same as is paid for annual rental, but this item is five or six or seven hundred per cent more than what we are now paying.

Mr. AUSTIN. The gentleman has challenged and criticized our judgment. Now, I would like to have his.

Mr. FREAR. I have given it three times.

Mr. AUSTIN. The gentleman has given me the judgment and opinion of the Postmaster General.

Mr. FREAR. I have given the gentleman my judgment.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let us have it on postal receipts and population.

Mr. FREAR. I do not care what the postal receipts may be. They have no relation whatever to the location of a new building, in my judgment. It should be a question of comparative cost under present conditions, and what is proposed to be the additional cost of maintenance. I can not make this plainer than that. Others have given different standards. All of them are more stringent than the present lack of standards.

Now I ask the privilege of reading this paragraph; I do not think it will take over two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for two minutes additional. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FREAR. On page 21 of the report of this commission, which made an extended and full investigation of the subject, it says:

Whenever public buildings are authorized quarters should be provided, if possible, for all permanent Government offices; but no provision should be made for any branch of the service that will not have real need of accommodations for at least one day each month, except in the case of United States courts. United States court accommodations should be provided only at places where courts have actually been in session for at least 10 days the preceding year.



It would seem to me if they were in session 20 days it would be sufficient, but it ought to be 30 days or more. The report continues:

This will prevent the designation for holding United States court for the purpose of securing original authorizations for buildings or additional appropriations to provide more imposing structures than have already been authorized. It is necessary in such cases to provide rooms for the court, judges, grand and petit juries, etc. The useless expenditure of public money for court accommodations should cease.

It states there should be some definite number of days of court or use assured as to that building before a building be authorized at that place. I submit there is nothing to indicate it in this case, or in any other case presented by this bill. Nothing is submitted, but under this proposal any expenditures may be demanded without need for other activities being shown. The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to strike out.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Lyons, N. Y., \$40,000.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. This is another item which the Treasury Department states will not appear to be of any profit to the Government. I want to call attention to the fact that in 1890 this town had a population of 4,475, 4,300 in 1900, and 4,460 in 1915, losing 15 in 20 years.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Marengo, Iowa, \$30,000.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, this seems to be another town where the population is less in 1910 than in 1900, having a population of 2,070 in 1900 and 1,786 in 1910. I would like to read from the hearings which took place on March 23, 1916, at which were present Mr. CLARK of Florida, chairman; Mr. BURNETT; and Mr. AUSTIN:

Mr. BURNETT. They have very small postal receipts and it is a very small town; \$7,500 postal receipts and only 1,786 population.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. JAMES. I will.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the postal receipts of this town increased over \$3,000 in one year—in 1915. It is something over \$7,000 in 1916. They have way over \$10,000.

Mr. JAMES. I am talking about the time the gentleman from Iowa appeared before the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. All right.

Mr. JAMES. And it is upon that information that the item for the public building was reported out in this bill.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If the gentleman will permit me, I stated yesterday distinctly that we not only had that information, but we looked into the prospects of the town where it appeared to be undoubtedly true that before this bill could be considered it would reach the limit, and allowed the item. I stated that several times.

Mr. JAMES. What did the gentleman do with the towns of Carlinville, Ill.; with Decatur, Ind.; Green River, Wyo.; with Greensburg, Ind.; with Linton, Ind.; with Newark, Del.; with Niles, Ohio.; with Rogersville, Tenn., where the postal receipts were less in the quarter ending September 30, 1916, than nine months before January 1, 1916?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. We will answer that when we get to them.

Mr. JAMES. I notice further along Mr. BURNETT repeats:

I notice that their postal receipts have increased only \$2,000 in 11 years. In 1905 they were over \$5,000, and this last year they were only \$7,000. That does not seem to be a very great increase.

And I want to say when \$7,500 postal receipts with a population of 1,786 seems small in Iowa it is considered very large for some other State in the Union.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to strike out. The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office, courthouse, and land office at Montrose, Colo., \$150,000.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The Clerk read is follows:

Page 13, line 14, after the last word "office," insert "and other Government offices."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I understand the committee accepts that. There is a large Government reclamation project there with some 25 or 30 clerks employed.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I suggest the word "and" before the word "land" should be stricken out.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I move that the word "and," in line 14 be stricken out so as to make it grammatically correct.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. There is no objection to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office and other Government offices at Morgan City, La., \$40,000.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. Morgan City, La., seems to have postal receipts, October 1 last, of \$8,370.63. It costs \$3,800 to maintain this building. This is another building which the Treasury Department states will not be profitable to the Government. The rent now paid is only \$960. Interest alone will be \$1,200 per annum on the proposed new building.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman one question?

Mr. JAMES. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY. I understand that my colleague's objection to various items in this bill is to those where the receipts are less than \$10,000. Is that correct?

Mr. JAMES. That is partly the reason; yes; partly the fact that we are facing a deficit of over \$300,000,000, and also the fact that I am not in favor of erecting public buildings or buying sites in dead, dying, or decadent towns.

Mr. KELLEY. I would like to ask my colleague whether or not he has made a list of all of such cities included in the bill and, if so, what the aggregate appropriations for these places would be?

Mr. JAMES. I will take each item as we come to it. While I have not made such a list, the Treasury Department has.

Mr. KELLEY. I am asking you if you have made a list and if you have made an aggregate? I would like to know the sum total.

Mr. JAMES. If the gentleman would like to know the list of the different projects that the Treasury Department does not recommend, and which they state could not be built with profit to the Government. I shall be pleased to put it in the RECORD.

Mr. KELLEY. You have not the information?

Mr. JAMES. I have a list of what they consider undesirable items, and of which they do not approve. The officials of the Treasury Department are in position to know whether or not these items are desirable.

Mr. KELLEY. I want to know what the aggregate expense provided in this bill for such projects as you are objecting to amounts to?

Mr. JAMES. I shall be pleased to put in the RECORD the different items criticized by the Treasury Department, and the gentleman can figure up the total amount.

Mr. KELLEY. My colleague has not added these items together?

Mr. JAMES. I shall be pleased to put these items in the RECORD. In the meantime, I expect to call attention of the House to each undesirable item as we reach it, and will show why a public building should not be built in the town mentioned, or why a site should not be purchased.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, to show the indiscriminate objection to these items I want to call attention to this one. Here is a town shown by the census of 1910 to have a population of 5,477 people. The amount being paid for rent is \$960 a year. There is to be taken care of the post office, the civil service, and the customs service. There is a customs office at Morgan City. The population is vastly more now, and the receipts are \$8,700, in addition to the customs, with a population of more than 5,000. And yet gentlemen object. As to these maintenance charges, I think I covered that in my original argument, in which I showed the employment of janitors was folly; that these supplies were folly.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No. It is simply ridiculous. There are no such maintenance charges as the gentlemen are talking about here.

I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Mount Olive, N. C., \$30,000.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.



The chairman of the committee states that the maintenance charges are folly. I wish to show from quoting Rochester, Minn., that \$900 and more is paid on buildings of this kind. The light at Rochester, Minn., was \$231.57; heat, \$435.50; water, \$132.11; miscellaneous supplies, \$74.69; removing ashes and rubbish, \$32.96, which shows that \$900 is being paid in small buildings of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office and other Government offices at Nephi, Utah, \$25,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to this item because it presents still another. I move to strike out the paragraph.

The population in 1910 was 2,759. The receipts last year were \$4,936, according to the statement which has been furnished us.

The rent was \$95 last year. The proposed annual cost of maintenance, as estimated by the Treasury Department, is \$3,800. It is an unprofitable investment. It is extravagance. What I desired to offer, however, was something that I could not find before when the chairman of the Buildings Committee spoke of a place for civil-service examinations.

Now, from this building commission's report, which was submitted by the commission of which the chairman was an honorable member at that time, I read in regard to civil-service examinations wherein the report says that they recommend such rooms be not included in the plans for public buildings. It recommends that these examinations can be held in other rooms of the buildings by the commission at less expense to the Government.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, in regard to all these various activities outside of the Post Office Department, this report gives specific advice as to what should be considered in these cases, and there is no evidence before the committee as to how many times during the year there will be civil-service examinations. The committee does not know, in fact. It can not show, very naturally it can not determine, from the situation. I submit with only \$95 annual rent, at a cost for maintenance of over \$3,000, it is not a very good investment for the Government.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a good deal of interest to the statement made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], and I want to congratulate him upon his conversion.

I find on examination of the records of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds that in the last Congress he introduced two bills, one of them providing for an appropriation of \$75,000 at Hudson, Wis., where the population was 2,810, where the postal receipts were \$10,528.34, and where the rental was \$720. He also introduced a bill providing for a \$75,000 building at Rice Lake, Wis., where the population was placed at 3,963 and the postal receipts at \$11,769.44, and where the rental was \$800. According to the figures made by the Treasury Department, covering interest, depreciation, janitor service, and supplies, the fixed charges would be \$6,247 per annum for each of these buildings. Now, the gentleman, in his speech of December 7, on page 107, criticizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds for bringing in the last public-buildings bill, refers to a number of towns as villages. Now, his village has a population of 2,810, and the ones he criticizes and denominates as villages, many of them, have a population in excess of the population of the towns mentioned in his bills.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want simply to congratulate the gentleman upon a change of front on this public question. His new idea is that such items represent a horrible waste and extravagance which he now points out and denounces. Virtually he committed himself to the system when he prepared the two bills and sent them to our committee, and he evidently did it in good faith and expected them to pass. That is why he introduced the bills, unless he is willing to publicly confess that he did it as pure buncombe, to get votes, and did not mean it.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. JAMES. Do you think that every time that a man introduces a bill for a public building he believes that bill is all right?

Mr. AUSTIN. Well, I would expect it in a reformer like yourself and your working colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR]; that you would practice precisely what you preach; that you would not ask the committee to consider an important bill unless you evidently prepared it in good faith and were acting in good faith.

Mr. JAMES. Have you found any bills introduced by me?

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, I have not said anything about the gentleman. I am simply congratulating his running mate in this debate on his conversion. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired. The question is on agreeing to the motion to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office and other Government offices at Newcastle, Wyo., \$25,000.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves to strike out the paragraph. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 14, by striking out lines 8 and 9.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, unless it has materially increased, the population of Newcastle, Wyo., is less now than it was 20 years ago. It had 1,715 in 1890 and only 975 in 1900, and the Government is now paying no rent at Newcastle, Wyo.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office and other Government offices at New Martinsville, W. Va., \$40,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the paragraph. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 14, by striking out lines 10 and 11.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, the population of this town was 21,076 in 1910, according to the statement. The receipts are \$10,538; the annual rent is \$622. The proposal, according to the department, will cost the Government \$4,800 a year for maintenance.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in all fairness to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], who addressed us a moment ago, let me say that I did introduce two bills when I first came here in the Sixty-third Congress, nearly three years ago. I had never heard about Treasury estimates at that time. I had never seen this Public Building Commission's report, which the gentleman from Tennessee signed, and which showed the governmental waste on all these propositions. I had not the faintest conception of what the public-building situation was at that time. That was at the beginning of the Sixty-third Congress, first session. But at this session, after three years and full information given by the Building Commission, here is an item introduced by the gentleman himself during this Sixty-fourth Congress. He asks for a public building at Jefferson City, a town of 1,328 population. In 1915 the receipts reached only \$4,771, for stamp sales. He asks for a building in that village to cost \$160,000. [Laughter.] And here are a number of items, all the way through the statement, of bills the gentleman from Tennessee has introduced at this session and long after having signed that report. [Applause.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, the bill mentioned by the gentleman did not call for \$160,000.

Mr. FREAR. That is the statement which I hold.

Mr. AUSTIN. That was an error made either by the Government Printing Office or by the clerk to the committee.

I am not an economist, and never have been. [Laughter.] I want to tell the gentleman I never vote against an appropriation and never vote for a tax. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Oelwein, Iowa, \$40,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. CLARK of Florida: On page 14, line 18, strike out the figures "\$40,000" and in lieu thereof insert the figures "\$50,000."



Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] called my attention to the fact that the committee had inadvertently put a less amount in this place than it ought to have in accordance with other towns of like size. Therefore I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office, Department of Justice, and other Government offices at Pikeville, Ky., \$35,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the item.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the paragraph. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 15, by striking out lines 1 and 2.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, the population of Pikeville, Ky., as shown by this statement, was 1,280 in 1910. The revenues annually, according to the statement of the Treasury Department, were \$6,149 for the sale of postage stamps in 1915, not for building public buildings. The rent last year was \$332. Under the new arrangement the estimate of cost to the Government will be \$3,500 a year, or more than ten times the present cost.

Now, the suggestion is made that this is for the Department of Justice. But let it be said, Mr. Chairman, there are already 12 Federal courthouses in Kentucky to-day, more than in the States of Illinois and Ohio put together. Yet down in Pikeville we are to have more Departments of Justice organized, notwithstanding the annual rent paid to-day is only \$332.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. I want to say that if the gentleman had paid attention to what I said yesterday about Pikeville, he would know that his statement is based upon conditions that existed seven years ago with reference to the population and other matters, and that the town has increased since then. The receipts thus far this year show that they will be over \$8,000 for the entire year, and they will soon be over \$10,000 for that matter.

Mr. FREAR. I do not want the gentleman to take all my time. The revenues last year were \$6,149. Of course the gentleman, as he said yesterday, introduced 11 bills, of which 8 were for purposes other than post offices. These other activities avoid the law which the committee assumes to consider. Every town will now want them.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman will learn in time how these matters work out.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does not the gentleman think that some States need more courts and more sheriffs than other States? [Laughter.]

Mr. FREAR. I am not an expert on that subject, either; but the gentleman from Kentucky must answer for himself.

Mr. LANGLEY. That may be true of Tennessee and Wisconsin, for ought I know. Of course I understand, Mr. Chairman, and so do the people of my district understand, that it would not be possible for me, or any other Member, to get at one time a public building provided for every place that I have introduced bills for, or even for every place in the district that needs such a building right now. They are just as intelligent as we are and they know how the public business at Washington is conducted or ought to be conducted. They know that it takes time to work out all of these matters and they know, too, whether their Member is doing his duty or not. It is true that I introduced a bill providing for a public building at each county seat in the district, and I believe that this ought to be done and will be done as soon as the public business at these points require it and the condition of the Treasury will admit of it. I believe it ought to be done not only as a good business proposition but because it would make the people feel in these localities that this great Government really recognizes them as an important and essential part of it by putting one of its buildings in their midst with the flag of the Nation flying over it. I am conscientious, gentlemen, in the belief that it would tend to instill a higher sense of patriotism in the hearts of the people, although, as I have already indicated, this is not nearly so much needed in the mountains of Kentucky as it is in certain other sections of the country. Mr. Chairman, it is only in recent years that the Federal Government has taken any steps toward the erection of public buildings in our section of Kentucky and I hope that I shall not be accused of immodesty if I say that I think I am entitled to some credit for what it

has done in this direction and that I expect to be entitled to still more. But, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is a single individual in the entire Tenth Kentucky District who believes, as has been intimated here and elsewhere, that I was seeking to mislead anyone in the different localities covered by these bills by making them believe that I expected to get all of these public buildings right away. They know my views and attitude on this question and that I will get these appropriations as rapidly as it is possible to do, giving preference, as the rules of the committee require, to the localities where the most urgent need exists for such building and where the volume of the Government business is the greatest. By this course the different towns and cities in the district have been better advised of the real situation and of the relative progress which each is making. Still another thing I had in view was to bring more forcefully to the attention of the entire country the real greatness of our section and the inexcusable manner in which the Federal Government has neglected and ignored it. I think it will be conceded, in view of this debate, that I have not failed in that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to strike out the paragraph.

The motion was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Rogersville, Tenn., \$25,000.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 15, by striking out lines 5 and 6.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Rossville, Ga., \$25,000.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 15, by striking out line 7.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, the postal receipts at Rossville, Ga., on October 1 last were \$8,333.61. The Government is now paying \$398 a year rent. It is estimated that the maintenance of the new building would cost \$4,200 a year. The population in 1910 was only 1,059 persons.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is to strike out the paragraph.

The motion was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office and other Government offices at Sandersville, Ga., \$30,000.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 15, by striking out lines 10 and 11.

Mr. JAMES. In October last the postal receipts at Sandersville, Ga., were \$8,618.05. The Government is now paying a rent of \$600. The maintenance of the new building would be \$4,800.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to strike out the paragraph.

The motion was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office and other Government offices at San Bernardino, Cal., \$70,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CLARK of Florida: Page 15, line 13, strike out the figures "\$70,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$85,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at St. Johns, Ore., \$25,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out lines 21 and 22, on page 15, for the United States post office at St. Johns, Ore., \$25,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 15, by striking out lines 21 and 22.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make this motion at the request of the gentleman from that district [Mr. McARTHUR], who requests it in view of the statement of the post-



master. He states that at the time the authorization was made for the purchase of a site for a Federal building at St. Johns, Oreg., St. Johns was a separate city with a separate post office. It is now a branch of the Portland office, and therefore the building is unnecessary.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, the city of St. Johns was made a part of the city of Portland, Oreg., by a vote of the people of the two cities in 1914. I understand that it is not the policy of the department or of Congress to appropriate money for buildings for branch post offices or substations. The separate office that was formerly maintained at St. Johns is now a substation of the Portland post office. There is on file with the committee a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury saying that there is no need for this appropriation for a building at St. Johns, because it is a substation of the Portland office. I ask unanimous consent to incorporate this letter as a part of my remarks. This letter quotes from a letter written to the Secretary of the Treasury by Hon. Frank S. Myers, postmaster of the city of Portland, Oreg.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, January 12, 1917.

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS,  
United States House of Representatives.

SIR: In response to your request of the 3d instant the following report is submitted on bill H. R. 16853, providing for the erection of a public building at St. Johns, Oreg.:

The post office requires 1,820 square feet floor space, and pays an annual rental of \$600.

The postal receipts for the fiscal year 1905 were \$2,437.02; and the receipts for the fiscal year 1915 are included in those for Portland, Oreg., of which city St. Johns is a station.

Purchase of a site was authorized by act of March 4, 1913, within a limit of cost of \$5,000.

It is estimated that a one-story building, with a ground area of 2,300 square feet, will be required, and that the cost of the same will be \$30,000.

In submitting information as to receipts, amount of space required, etc., the Post Office Department included a communication from the postmaster, Portland, Oreg., in which the following statements occur:

"The appropriation of \$5,000 to purchase a site for the proposed St. Johns Federal building was made at a time when St. Johns was a separate post office of a separate city. For several years St. Johns was a branch of this office. It is now a station of this office, and the former city of St. Johns is now within the corporate limits of the city of Portland."

"So far as I know, there is no demand from any source for a Federal building at St. Johns; in fact, there is about as much need for a Federal building at St. Johns station of this office as there is for another Washington Monument in Washington, D. C. My opinion is that the people of this city would look upon the construction of a Federal building at St. Johns as a waste of public money."

Respectfully,

W. G. McAdoo, Secretary.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, the St. Johns substation receipts for the last fiscal year amounted to \$6,058, and as the community is growing in size and importance it would soon be entitled to a Federal building had it not been merged with the city of Portland. I introduced the St. Johns building bill in good faith, for I was not then aware of the well-established policy of not appropriating money for substations. In view of this policy and the statements made by the postmaster at Portland it would be futile for me to oppose the motion to strike the item from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment to strike out lines 21 and 22, on page 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Union Springs, Ala., \$25,000.

Mr. JAMES. I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, strike out lines 8 and 9.

Mr. JAMES. On October 1, 1916, the postal receipts of Union Springs, Ala., were \$7,005.01. On January 1, at the time the bill was introduced, the postal receipts were \$7,027. The Government is now paying no rent at all at Union Springs, Ala., and this is one of the items condemned by the Treasury Department, which estimates that it will cost the Government \$4,800 a year to maintain the proposed structure.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Unionville, Mo., \$30,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, amend by striking out lines 10 and 11.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, the reason for this motion is contained in a statement which I have read from before and which covers 200 items, most of which are stated to be wasteful as to cost. Unionville, Mo., is given here as a town of 2,000 population in 1910. The postal receipts last year, 1915, were \$6,956.44. The rental is \$450 a year. The amount of cost for maintenance will be \$4,000, as estimated by the department, or an increase for maintenance of 800 per cent. I desire to read from the report of the public-building commission some suggestions which have come through the Treasury Department. Many think that the department sits up there by itself and urges its own ideas, but here are statements made by Congressmen to the Secretary of the Treasury which have been put into the report. Mr. McAdoo's letter follows, and here are the statements on page 74. It says:

Many suggestions were received in reply to this invitation. Congress is apparently keenly alive to the necessity for a change in the public-buildings system. Below are given a few of the suggestions which are selected to give a general view of the expressions of opinion.

"It is wrong to complete buildings in small towns—'tank towns'—to the exclusion of needed and necessary improvements in larger cities."

"Something is radically wrong in the system of the Supervising Architect's Office. Plans and specifications should be duplicated."

"Standardize the need for buildings."

"Post offices and buildings in small towns are too expensive."

"Private concerns would build at half the expense."

"Suspend building until the present changing needs of the Post Office Department are settled."

"Use standard-type plans for buildings under \$500,000."

"Build only when the commercial necessities demand it. Omit court rooms in small towns where court is rarely held. Use simple architecture and standardize appropriations."

"Erect buildings only on the recommendation of the head of the department. Get away from the 'pork barrel'."

"Conditions governing appropriations are bad. Appropriations should not be made for cities of less than 15,000 people."

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. KING. Does the gentleman think that the adoption of the suggestions which he is reading from would relieve this bill of the accusation of being a pork-barrel bill?

Mr. FREAR. I am not prepared to say. I would accept in preference to that the proposition of the distinguished Speaker of this House, who made a proposition which I believe is fair and preferable. He proposes that after the receipts have reached a certain amount, whatever may be the sum agreed upon, that thereafter automatically it is taken away from Congress to determine; no matter what section of the country was interested, the building would automatically be constructed under the law. But we are 2,000 buildings behind, according to any reasonable estimate, if all cities are to be provided under the terms of this bill, yet we are building only 100 post offices a year, and we will never catch up. We must face this situation; the sooner the better.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. I want to ask the gentleman why he is being controlled by the recommendations of the Treasury Department, when he absolutely fights the tests and recommendations of the War Department and the engineers in the river and harbor improvement?

Mr. FREAR. I am not reading from the Treasury Department report; I am reading from the recommendations of Congressmen contained in letters to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. AUSTIN. But the gentleman has been quoting the Treasury Department all through this bill from the time the consideration began. Why does not the gentleman quote the War Department and the engineers in the river and harbor bill?

Mr. FREAR. Because they are absolutely unreliable, and I will show you when you get into the bill that their recommendations are unreliable and extravagant, because they do not understand business methods nor the needs of navigation.

Mr. AUSTIN. Can not the Treasury Department be wrong?

Mr. FREAR. Possibly so; but this is a question of dollars and cents easy of ascertainment, and can be determined if not correct in any particular. It is a mere matter of ascertainment based on experience and investments required.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Urbana, Ohio, \$50,000.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to make a statement. This is the item in the bill that was introduced by myself. I will vote to strike it out if the House will vote to amend the bill to strike out the items that fall below the \$10,000 receipts recommended by the department. The question has been raised as to the ethics of a Member voting



against a bill who has an item in the bill. The post-office site at Urbana, Ohio, was purchased at a cost of \$13,000 by the Government some time soon after a bill was presented in 1910. I introduced a bill to erect a building with a limit of cost at \$50,000. The bill is reported in an omnibus bill with over 200 items in it that do not fall within the recommendations of the department, but this item has more than three times the amount in the way of receipts that is recommended in the last paragraph of the present bill.

I am not here to be the monitor of the ethics of Members of this House, and I am not here to be the arbiter of the judgment of the Members of this House. I certainly am not the keeper of any man's conscience in this House except my own. Therefore, I am not going to impugn the motives of men in their attitude on this bill. That is not my business and I am not going to do more than to criticize the methods of this legislation. I know that it is the judgment of this House that this method of legislating must stop. It will not continue. It must appear to every Member present that the country will not stand for it much longer. While I have no sympathy with the method that is taken in what might be regarded a filibuster against any measure, for I know that this bill in all probability will be passed by the House unless a change of attitude takes place, and while I am perfectly satisfied that it will not be considered at all in the Senate, and therefore I need not have much solicitation about the final vote on the bill, yet the judgment of the people is against this method of legislation. I will make a motion to strike out this item for Urbana if it will carry a defeat of this bill in the House. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to understand the gentleman. Does he make a motion to strike out the item, or does he attach some condition to it?

Mr. FESS. I made a motion to strike out the last word in order to make this statement.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Merely a pro forma amendment. The gentleman intends to withdraw that pro forma amendment.

Mr. FESS. In order that I may state to the House whether I think it ethical to vote against the bill when it includes an item meeting all the requirements of the department for a building.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I understand. The gentleman is willing that his item should be defeated if all the rest are defeated?

Mr. FESS. Yes; I would make a motion to strike out the item, but I am not willing it should be stricken out unless the others are. [Laughter and applause.] That may appear to have been a statement compromising my position, but I hope that I am not misunderstood.

Mr. Chairman, this is the thing that embarrasses me. There are Members on this floor, lovable in character, whose judgment I greatly appreciate, who believe that we ought to have "our share." My good friend, whom I love, a most amiable character, and one of the keenest debaters I have heard within this Chamber, my friend Mr. BURNETT, used the expression "our share" several times on yesterday; many others employed the same phraseology. I can not understand that angle in legislation about "our share." This is Uncle Sam's business, and if Uncle Sam finds it profitable and desirable to put a building in one place, well and good, but to say that it is patriotic to get "our share" is to invoke an angle of legislation that I do not understand, and I impugn the motives of no man when I say this, and that is the enormity of it—they believe it and sincerely believe it.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is willing to take his "share" and hold his "share" in the bill unless the other "shares" go out of it.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. FESS. It is not a share; it is a building by Uncle Sam, and the profits in Urbana will be much more than the expenses, and therefore will be a profitable movement—not merely a convenience for the people of Urbana, but a proper business step for the Government of the United States.

Mr. BURNETT. And yet the gentleman is willing to strike it out, meritorious as it is, if they will strike out the other fellow's "share." That is the idea.

Mr. FESS. I would like to make one other statement. I may be misunderstood. I shall move to strike out Urbana if [Cries of "Go ahead!"]—I shall move to strike out Urbana if we strike out, not all the items, but if we strike out all the more than 200 items the receipts of which are less than \$10,000, and Urbana's receipts are nearly \$30,000. That is the proposition I

will put to you. It is a high price to pay, but not too high for the remedy of such legislation as herein proposed.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I agree with what my colleague [Mr. Fess] has said in many respects, and I regret that we have to have an omnibus bill in order to get a public-buildings bill through this House. It seems that is the only way to do it. I want to say to him that if he will make a motion to strike out all of these places the receipts of which are under \$10,000 I shall vote with him. I am going to vote for this measure because it contains a provision for a post office in my district. [Laughter.] There is no post office in my district, and Painesville, Ohio, needs such a building. If I have to vote for a bill that is called a pork bill, if that is the manner of doing business in Congress, I shall have to submit to it. If I must vote for places that do not deserve a building in order to get one for a place that deserves it, then I will have to do it. I regret to have to do it, but I shall have to do it if it is necessary to proceed in that way in order to get a public building in my district. [Laughter and applause.]

I think a great many things that the gentleman from Ohio said are correct, but I shall stand by the bill. It seems that some law should be enacted whereby, as the distinguished Speaker of this House has stated, when a place reaches a certain point as regards population and receipts it should automatically have a public building. I have voted to strike out of this bill every item where the figures did not justify it. The method of enacting this legislation is wrong, just as my colleague [Mr. Fess] has stated, and I hope in the future this may be remedied.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at West Point, Va., \$25,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 16, in line 17, by inserting, after the word "office," the words "and customhouse."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, the question that is raised in my mind by the repeated statement of the word "pork" here is, What is pork in a public appropriation bill? Is it pork to come here to the city of Washington, the Capital of the Nation, and tax the rural communities, the small towns, the people who live away from the Capital, and who will never see it, in order that we may make this the most beautiful city in the world? Is it pork to go into the seaports and erect there beautiful customhouses, constructed of marble, in order to add to the beauty of the particular city, and to add to the environments of the community in which it is constructed? Is it pork to go into the various places where the Government does things not merely for utilitarian purposes but for the purpose of beautifying the community and encouraging the people in that community to have some higher ideals than merely groveling for money? Is it pork when we take money to construct great vessels for the Navy, vessels which are not merely engines of destruction, but in which we put things that appeal to the taste of the men who are on them, in order to give them music on board ship, to give them libraries and handsome rooms, to put the proper equipment there, and to give them expensive craft in which they may go ashore and be brought back in the dignity commensurate with the position they occupy? If that is not pork, if that is justifiable, then why is it not just as reasonable to go into the small towns of the United States, where the people are taxed from day to day to carry on the Central Government and maintain it, and there construct public buildings? Why is it not justifiable to go into these communities, where these people issue bonds to erect handsome courthouses in these little towns not merely because they may have to have a handsome courthouse to do the work the court is called upon to do but because they want to beautify the town and encourage civic pride? Is it wrong to go there, where they tax themselves to try to build up better influences, in order to make better American citizens, and construct handsome post offices? If it is not wrong for this Government to tax those people to carry on these improvements in the great cities, then I resent the charges of gentlemen like the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon], that the Representatives of the rural communities are here taxing these people wrongfully to give their people their full share in this Government. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Waynesboro, Ga., \$25,000.



Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 16, by striking out lines 19 and 20.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, on October 1 last the postal receipts of Waynesboro, Ga., were only \$7,452.39. This is a town of 2,729 people. The Government is now paying a rent of \$400 a year, and it will cost \$4,200 a year to maintain the new building.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Winnfield, La., \$30,000: *Provided*, That a suitable site shall be conveyed to the United States by the city of Winnfield or citizens thereof, free of cost, said site to be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, after line 2, insert the following: "United States post office at Woodstock, Ill., \$45,000."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state in explanation that that item was inadvertently left out of the bill. It is within the district of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COPLEY]. I move the adoption of the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Bloomington, Ill., \$150,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 18, strike out the figures "\$150,000" and insert the figures "\$185,000."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I will state in explanation of that amendment that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING], who represents that district, introduced a bill asking for \$150,000. The department in its report insisted upon \$185,000. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING] thought at that time \$150,000 would be ample. He has since made investigation, and we are satisfied that \$185,000, the original estimate of the department, ought to be put in the bill. I move the adoption of the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Clare, Mich., \$35,000.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 18, amend by striking out line 1:

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I notice that this is a Michigan item introduced by one of my colleagues [Mr. LOUP]. The original amount of the bill as introduced was \$50,000. The committee has allowed \$35,000. Clare, Mich., only had a population of 1,174 in 1890 and 1,326 in 1900 and 1,350 in 1910. I think we ought to have a chance, Mr. Chairman, to criticize undesirable items like this, and I am glad therefore that resolution 400, sponsored by the Public Buildings Committee, and which would have prevented my offering this amendment, was not reported out by the Rules Committee. There is no reason that a town, whether it is in Michigan, Maine, Alabama, or Kentucky, or where it is located, and which only increased 24 in 10 years, that only had postal receipts of \$8,590 at the time the bill was introduced by my colleague, is entitled to a \$35,000 post office. The bill as introduced would necessitate an expenditure of \$3,600 for maintenance, including interest, depreciation of the building and furniture, janitor, heat, electric light, etc., or practically three-fourths of the postal receipts of that town. The rent now being paid is \$549.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. What did the gentleman say the receipts were in 1915?

Mr. JAMES. Eight thousand five hundred and ninety dollars on January 1, 1916.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I beg the gentleman's pardon; they were \$10,017.88.

Mr. JAMES. The statement I hold from the Treasury Department—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I got mine from the Post Office Department.

Mr. JAMES. Yes; and when the gentleman's hearings were held, and when Congressmen appeared before the committee on

behalf of any item, they quoted to you figures furnished them by the Treasury Department.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. These were the exact figures we had. Mr. JAMES. So, according to the figures prepared by the Treasury Department, this town had postal receipts of only \$8,590.91 on January 1, 1916. I do not believe the people of Clare themselves want a post office of that kind—\$35,000.

As I stated, the rent is now only \$549. The interest on the proposed \$35,000, at 3 per cent, would be \$1,050. Judging from the experience of the Government, it will cost \$960 for janitor, fireman, and scrub woman. In addition, it would cost \$900 each year for fuel, electric light, etc. And judging from the experience of the Government at Newark, N. Y., these figures are correct. For the fiscal year of 1916 at Newark, N. Y., the expenses were as follows:

Light	\$303.43
Heat	438.31
Water	24.38
Miscellaneous items	80.92
Ice	15.25
Removing ashes and rubbish	21.75
Washing towels	9.37
Total	\$893.41

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I notice that my colleague from Michigan [Mr. LOUP] is not on the floor. This town is in his district, and as Mr. LOUP is not here I want to say to my colleague [Mr. JAMES] that I know something about the village or city of Clare, which, I think, perhaps might throw a little light upon the subject of its population. The city of Clare lies partly in Isabella County and partly in Clare County. Now, as I recollect it, only that portion of the city that lies in Clare County is included in the city limits. There are some five or six hundred people who are actually inhabitants of the city of Clare living just across the county line in Isabella County, but are not included in the census for the city of Clare. I think perhaps that will explain the matter of population. This is quite a rapidly growing, flourishing community in the central part of Michigan. I know if my colleague [Mr. LOUP] were here he could give the House more exact information, but a good many years ago I used to teach school at Mr. Pleasant, which is a near-by city, and I know quite a bit about the locality and the location of the town. I particularly recall that it is partly in one county and partly in another, and the portion in Isabella County does not lie within the corporate limits of the city.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman say the population of Clare has increased?

Mr. KELLEY. Oh, yes; I am sure it has increased, but what I am saying particularly is that the figures given by my colleague [Mr. JAMES] may mislead the House as to the actual population of Clare, because perhaps five or six hundred people live across the county line who are not included in the figures which he gave.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Michigan is a highly respected Member of this House and I would take his word on the question. Does the gentleman think there is a necessity for a new post office?

Mr. KELLEY. I would not go as far as to say that. I have not been in Clare for a good many years. I am only directing my remarks to the question of population, which I wanted to state correctly as I understand it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The rest of the Members are not informed in this matter. Does the gentleman think that item ought to be stricken out?

Mr. KELLEY. I do not. The chairman of the committee [Mr. CLARK] has stated that the receipts of the office of Clare are above \$10,000 and I do not see any reason why the item should be stricken out, if other towns where the receipts are no greater are left in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to strike out.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Circleville, Ohio, \$65,000.

Mr. RICKETTS. I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this bill providing an appropriation for the erection of public buildings and the purchase of grounds as sites whereon to erect public buildings, and to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings, and to abolish the Office of Supervising Architect of the Treasury, and create and organize in the Treasury Department a bureau of public buildings, and to define its duties, powers, and jurisdiction, and to create and establish the office of commissioner of public buildings, and to create a board of estimates and prescribe its duties and powers, and for other purposes therein mentioned, is not unlike numerous



bills of similar character that have been passed by the House of Representatives for many years past.

The last public-buildings bill passed by Congress was approved by the President on March 4, 1913, and carried authorizations which in the aggregate amounted to approximately \$40,000,000. Since that time the growth of the country in population, in wealth, and in business, manufacturing, and industrial enterprises has been so great as to increase tremendously the demand for new, enlarged, and better facilities for the economic and efficient transaction of public business throughout the country. Every line of Federal activity has kept pace with the progress of the age, and to-day in very many of the cities and towns of the country the public business is being conducted in such very crowded, ill-ventilated, and unsanitary quarters as not only to reduce materially the efficiency of the employees but seriously jeopardize their health.

I think all of the Members of this House will agree with me that such conditions should not be permitted to continue, and while this bill does not seek to remedy all the existing evils, a great many of them will be remedied should this bill be enacted into law.

The Government should transact its business in a businesslike manner, and this bill is a long step toward placing the building operations of the Government on a sound, sensible, economic, and businesslike basis.

#### COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

The bill provides for the abolition of the Office of Supervising Architect of the Treasury, and creates in lieu thereof a bureau of public buildings, placing at the head of such bureau an officer to be known as the commissioner of public buildings, who is to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who is to hold office for a term of four years. This bureau of public buildings is given complete jurisdiction over and control of the selection of sites, drafting of plans and specifications, supervision of construction, and the care and maintenance of all public buildings.

I consider this a wise step in legislation.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] on last Tuesday, during the public debate of this bill, in a very clear, concise, and pointed manner explained to this House why this provision was a wise one. I most heartily concur, if I may be allowed to do so, in his deductions and conclusions, with reference to the Treasury Department's failure to transact and carry on the public-buildings business of this Government. I think this department well deserves to be criticized for its failure to conduct the public-buildings business in a businesslike manner. The Treasury Department relies altogether on the Supervising Architect to determine the sites where public buildings shall be erected, and decide the size, kind, and class of public buildings that shall be erected thereon. His judgment in the past has been greatly criticized by the business men of the various cities and towns of the country wherein Government buildings have been erected, and I think justly so.

#### PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

I hope the time may come when this Government will own its own post-office building in each and every city and town throughout the country where the post-office receipts are \$10,000 and upward annually.

This Government has been paying enormous rents for the use of post-office buildings for many years, and has been compelled to use and occupy buildings that were not adapted to the business for which they have been used.

#### REVENUE.

The Post Office Department during the last fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, collected in revenue from the sale of stamps, money-order business, and postal-savings business the sum of \$312,057,688.83. This enormous sum is a tax paid by the people for the purpose of raising revenue in order to carry on and conduct in a legitimate manner the post-office business throughout the country. The expenditures in carrying on the post-office business during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, were the sum of \$287,248,165.27, which leaves a surplus or excess over and above expenditures of \$24,809,523; so it is plain to be seen that this is an important branch of Government business. And not only so, but it is a thriving, growing business. The receipts for the last fiscal year are the highest in the history of the country. Since 1800 the post-office business in the United States has gradually and constantly grown. There is no branch of the business of this Government in which the people of the country are more directly interested. It is through this branch of Government business that the industrial and commercial business of the country is carried on, and therefore the facilities and necessary equipment to successfully prosecute the business should be provided by the Government. The people pay the bill. Why not, then, give them the benefit?

In my judgment, in enacting this bill into law we will be rendering a great public service that will be beneficial, profitable, and entirely satisfactory, as well as appreciated by many of the people throughout the United States.

#### PORK.

Nearly all the great cities of the United States have been provided with public buildings, and consequently many Members from these cities are not interested in the passage of this bill.

Some of the editors of the press of the country have criticized this measure severely and have designated it as what is commonly known as "pork." I think this criticism, in a very large measure, is unjust and unfair. The criticism comes, of course, from the cities which have already been supplied with public buildings. It is a selfish criticism, to say the least of it.

My support of this bill is in no way influenced by the criticism lodged against it by the great cities now enjoying the occupancy and benefits of Government public buildings.

I have read this bill through and through carefully, and while I am willing to concede that there are some items in it that might have been omitted, yet the bill as a whole can not be honestly designated as "pork." It is a meritorious bill, and, in my judgment, should receive the support of a majority of the Members of this House.

There is scarcely a bill that comes before Congress that is not criticized, more or less. Each and every bill has some objectionable features, some features which might have been omitted or differently stated. I know that for several years certain metropolitan newspapers, magazines, and other publications have been loud in their denunciation of Congress for what they have been pleased to term "pork-barrel legislation." It may be true that there are in some of the omnibus bills passed by Congress a few items which on examination would appear not to have been justified, but that is not true of this bill.

As a Member of Congress I have never voted for a bill which, in my judgment, was subject to criticism as a "pork-barrel" measure. I know that men's minds differ as to the construction to be placed upon legislation. We do not all see alike. If we did, this would be rather a peculiar world.

#### CIRCLEVILLE.

Circleville was laid out in the year 1810 on one of the old Indian fortifications. The original town plat contained 208 private building lots, besides 5 circular and triangular areas of ground for public use. It has always been, and is still, recognized as an export city.

On the 18th day of May, 1916, I introduced in this House H. R. 15776, being a bill authorizing the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal public building at Circleville, Pickaway County, Ohio. In this bill I asked for an appropriation of \$100,000, because I believed that the city of Circleville, being the county seat of Pickaway County, one of the most fertile counties in the State of Ohio, was justly in need of such a building and that the people of that city and county deserved it.

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, under its rules, could not grant me the relief I sought in this bill, and consequently reduced the amount so as to conform the same to the rules of the committee.

Circleville has a population of approximately 8,000 people. Eight rural routes running out of Circleville serve 5,000 people, which makes a total of 13,000 people receiving mail from this office, irrespective of transients. The receipts of the post office of this city for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, were \$17,000.

#### PRESENT POST-OFFICE BUILDING.

The present post-office quarters are in a room very much too small for the accommodation of the business. The desks and work tables are all crowded, and the employees hampered in their work.

The room is located in a building in a congested district of the city, the light of which is cut off by abutting and adjacent buildings on each side, and the building is exposed to danger by fire from all surrounding quarters. The danger from fire lessens the safety of the mails, and should a fire occur would interrupt and possibly destroy the service. The post-office building and those adjacent to it are all of the old type of architecture and none of them are fireproof.

It is necessary to work the mails by artificial light, both day and night. There are 23 gas jets or burners in operation in the post-office room, which consume the oxygen in the room in winter and in summer they create such heat as to greatly diminish the capacity and efficiency of those employed in discharging the duties of the office.

The ventilation in this room is bad, and there are no modern conveniences.

There is no place for the mail carriers to hitch their horses or leave their vehicles, and some of the carriers are obliged to leave their vehicles a distance of a block from the post office.



The building is heated by two unsanitary natural-gas stoves. It is now necessary to rent safety-deposit boxes outside of the post office for the safeguarding of the stamps.

There are no quarters for the shelter or convenience of the city carriers in the interval between their trips, and they are, therefore, left to shift for themselves, which results in great inconvenience and discomfort to the carriers, especially in inclement weather.

It is certainly conclusive evidence, from the above facts and beyond dispute that the erection of a Federal building in Circleville is an urgent necessity, for the proper transaction and execution of the business of the Government and for the service and accommodation of the citizens of the city, and the patrons of its post office.

Circleville is one of the most beautiful and enterprising county seats in the State of Ohio. Its residences and public buildings are modern, massive, and picturesque. It contains many substantial, modern, and attractive business blocks.

The following summary of statistics will give you some idea of the commercial and industrial activities of the citizens of this city and some idea of its wealth:

This beautiful city has 5 miles of paved streets and 30 miles of improved streets.

The city building represents an investment of.....	\$20,000
Memorial Hall.....	35,000
Opera house.....	25,000
Hospital and Old Ladies' Home.....	23,000
Fire department.....	50,000
Public library, containing 2,000 volumes, which has just received a cash bequest of.....	10,000
City school buildings.....	250,000
New hospital.....	35,000
Courthouse, jail, and sheriff's residence.....	300,000
Churches aggregating an investment of.....	302,000
Masonic Temple.....	35,000
Odd Fellows Building.....	30,000
Knights of Pythias Temple.....	30,000
Elks Building.....	10,000
Athletic Club.....	25,000
Well Building.....	50,000
Traction station.....	20,000

This city has the largest horse market in the State of Ohio. It has the largest straw-board plant in the world, which embraces 47 acres of land, more than 10 acres of which are covered with buildings.

This city has the greatest export canned-goods trade in the United States. The approximate export trade is 23,000,000 cans annually, which are distributed to all parts of the globe.

Circleville has a large milling interest which manufactures and exports hundreds of carloads of meal annually. It has large manufacturing interests.

The tax duplicate of this city shows an aggregate sum of \$8,265,270.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.'s local business at Circleville in 1915 amounted to \$55,600.

The Norfolk & Western Railroad Co. in 1915 delivered 5,239 carloads of freight in this city.

#### PICKAWAY COUNTY.

Circleville is the county seat of Pickaway County, Ohio. Pickaway (or Piqua) is an Indian name. It is said to have been the name of a numerous family of the Shawnee Tribe of Indians who occupied the Pickaway plains at an early period. The meaning of the word is unknown to the whites, though it had undoubtedly a significant meaning, as all Indian names had.

The name was given by law to the county, though originally it had been confined to the plains in the southern part of the county. These plains bore that name among the Indians when the whites first entered the country or knew anything about it.

Pickaway County is 22 by 21 miles in extent, and contains about 470 square miles. This county contains the Pickaway plains, and is one of the most fertile counties in the State of Ohio, rich in the production of corn, wheat, cattle, horses, swine, and all other agricultural products. It has a tax duplicate value of \$42,054,895.

Can any Member of this House, in good conscience, say, in the face of the above statistical facts, that this city and county should not have an appropriation of \$65,000 for a Government post office building?

These people are progressive, industrious, and enterprising, and, as their Representative in this House, I have used every honorable means to bring about this appropriation.

Nearly every class of citizenship represented in this city and county, including the merchants, the professional men, the newspaper men, the political parties, the secret organizations, the Christian people, the Chamber of Commerce, the ministers of the Gospel, the bankers, the farmers, the laboring classes, and the citizenship generally, have petitioned Congress, through

me, to grant them this appropriation, and I am endeavoring to impress you with my loyalty to their cause.

I sincerely hope that this House may see its way clear to pass this bill.

It is true that this city and county are in the district which I have the honor to represent, and I have pledged my word to those people to leave no stone unturned to secure for them the Federal building which they so much desire and deserve.

The county seats in every county bounding Pickaway now have public buildings, given them by an appropriation made through Congress, and it is only fair to the good people of Circleville and Pickaway County that they be accorded the same consideration that Congress has heretofore given to the adjoining counties and county seats.

If there is one official act that I hope to perform to the satisfaction of those concerned before the expiration of my term in this House, it is to secure for the people of Circleville and Pickaway County a Federal post office building. I assured these people that I would do everything in my power to secure this building for them, and I am trying my best to fulfill my promise.

I know that some of the Members of this House for selfish reasons alone are against this bill. You say it is "pork." You must have some excuse for your action. At the last session of this Congress some of you who are objecting to this bill voted for the rivers and harbors appropriation of \$43,000,000, and in this session of Congress you are preparing yourselves to again vote for an additional appropriation of \$38,000,000, under the guise that you must conserve the great fertile valley of the Mississippi. You know that this bill is a meritorious one, and you know that you should support it.

Section 15 of this bill provides:

That it shall be the duty of the custodians of all public buildings of the United States of America and all buildings in which is located a post office of the United States to raise over such building the flag of the United States of America on each secular day when weather conditions are favorable. It shall be the duty of any department of the Government under which division said buildings or post offices are controlled to provide any such building a suitable flag for the purposes herein provided.

I am heartily in accord with this provision of the bill, and I hope that I may live to see the day when that grand old emblem of freedom, with her 7 red and 6 white stripes and 48 stars may be unfurled to the American people from these buildings, and that Circleville may have one of the new buildings in this Union, whose citizens may enjoy and appreciate the sight, fully realizing that Congress at last has recognized their claim and has given them what they honestly need and justly deserve. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Council Grove, Kans., \$35,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the item. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 18, by striking out lines 8 and 9.

Mr. FREAR. So far as the record goes, it is no different than the preceding 12 building items which have just been read, which, according to the Government, will be maintained at a loss. Council Grove had 2,545 inhabitants at the last census, \$9,041 receipts, and \$540 rent, and will cost the Government \$3,500 annually to maintain a building after it is built. I do not rise to discuss that proposition alone. The gentleman who last spoke says that the common people of America are to be benefited by this bill. I would like to ask him to consider whether the farmers of his district and throughout the United States, who have about one-third of the population in this country and pay their share of direct and indirect taxes, are to be benefited particularly by this bill, which contains 200 items that the Treasury Department says will be at a loss? If they are, then how and where?

Mr. RICKETTS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. My friend from Michigan [Mr. JAMES] just had handed to him a note which reads as follows:

When we get through with buildings why not submit an amendment to put a \$30,000 post office in every city of the United States having \$10,000 receipts?

Such an amendment would not be as ridiculous as the rest of the bill necessarily. I have right here the report of the Public Buildings Commission on that very point, which I referred to once before. On page 77 occurs this statement:

There are 508 cities in the United States which had post-office receipts of \$10,000 and over—

Remember, this report was made since the last public-building bill was passed—

in 1913, towns which were not provided with post-office buildings.



Fifteen States have no post offices with receipts of \$10,000 or over without post-office buildings.

And it gives a list of them.

Among the 30 States that have will be found 77 cities in Pennsylvania of over \$10,000 receipts that were not provided for four years ago. New York had 56 cities that were not provided for; Illinois had 30 cities of over \$10,000 receipts at that time that have not been provided for. Wisconsin had 22 unprovided. And so continues the statement, showing the whereabouts of all the different cities now unprovided.

I submit that this note which comes to my friend from Michigan may be suggestive of a good argument in favor of taking care of those 508 cities which at that time were not provided with public buildings. They could be taken care of in this bill at this particular time, if good business required, when the Treasury faces a \$300,000,000 deficit. I say, if those items already provided for in this bill are proper, why not put all such projects in here as well as the few that have been selected geographically and mathematically here and there?

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman kindly state for the benefit of the House who signed that note?

Mr. FREAR. I have no idea. It makes no difference. It is the text, which I ask the gentleman to take home to himself, and answer, if he can, on the floor of the House. Why not put the 508 places that are equally just, according to the committee, all in the bill?

Mr. AUSTIN. Would that include the two the gentleman offered?

Mr. KING. Why not offer an amendment?

Mr. FREAR. I do not believe it is right in either case.

Mr. RICKETTS. The gentleman knows this is not new legislation, but has been going on for a number of years.

Mr. FREAR. You will never get rid of it with the argument the gentleman offered on the floor. We must uproot a bad system if we meet the matter squarely.

Mr. KING. What would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. FREAR. I have suggested a number of times different plans advanced by those who have given this question much study. I can not discuss the matter in the limited time I have.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I understand the gentleman thinks we ought to put 508 other items in the bill?

Mr. FREAR. No; I do not. I am frank to say no. But with equal justice I say it could be done with many items that are in this bill now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to answer the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], so far as the argument just made is concerned, but I am thankful to him for having called attention to the fact that in Pennsylvania and certain other large States there are many cities qualified under this bill to receive post offices that have not yet obtained one. And, basing what I have to say upon that premise, without any feeling at all, and with a desire to be perfectly fair, I want to relate a little personal experience with regard to measures of this kind.

When I came into the House 10 years ago I came believing that a great river that flows by my city had not been properly taken care of by Congress, and I undertook individually to do some things to obtain an improvement of that river. It was not long before I found that there were many other rivers in the United States demanding attention; that there were 50,000 miles of navigable rivers, one-half of them unimproved; and that I could not get separate provision for my river unless other Members of Congress obtained some consideration for theirs. And it was an eye opener to me—which, I assume, it will be in due course to other new Members of Congress—that no particular individual can come into this House charged with a feeling of injustice, and run away with his own particular improvement to the prejudice of other improvements throughout the country that may be equally deserving with his. [Applause.]

And so I have come to be liberal with respect to the treatment of river and harbor bills, and so I want to be liberal with respect to this public-buildings bill. We are interested in Pennsylvania in several items in this bill. I am particularly interested in a bill to provide a customhouse site for the great city of Philadelphia. We have been waiting since Andrew Jackson broke the United States Bank to obtain this customhouse at Philadelphia—a customhouse which in normal times turns into the Treasury of the United States \$20,000,000 a year in revenue—but because there are other sections of the country, growing in

population, which demand consideration in the matter of public buildings, and which are deserving, we have been postponed in this ambition and necessity of ours, lo, these 75 years.

It is not because individual bills have not been introduced. It is not because committees have not favorably considered this particular project. It is because in the very nature of things, by reason of the population of the country, there are other sections demanding consideration along with us; and I want to say to my friends who have been opposing this bill—I hope and believe in good faith—and to those who have said that their particular projects are all right, but that all other particular projects are all wrong—I want to say to them that a longer experience in this House and a closer association with the Members who come up from Louisiana and over from California and down from Maine will convince every one of them that there is virtue in the claims made by our colleagues and that we are not ourselves the only pure and sanctified Members of this House. [Applause.]

I say this respectfully, because I know that many new Members come into this House with an indignation born of too much magazine reading, some of them impelled by a desire to crush the mythical octopus in Congress, or others possibly to shine in the public eye as great reformers. I know, as every other Member of the House knows, that this is a great equalizing and leveling body and that here all men stand on a par and each project stands upon its merits. I have respect for and confidence in the committee, and I trust that we may proceed speedily to the passage of this bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a pro forma amendment to strike out the last word, just to say a word.

I have listened to the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] and am interested in what he has said for your consideration. I have been acquainted with public-building bills and river and harbor bills for, lo, these many years. Frankly, I could pick out his project and the Chicago project and a few others that did not pass without other Members who have constituencies being interested. I am not an enemy of public buildings, nor am I an enemy of river and harbor improvements. You have to take the world as you find it, and where there is a large expenditure made, as there is in this country now, with appropriations amounting annually to a billion and a half dollars plus, with an absolute necessity for legislation at this or a near-by session for any increase of taxation, with authority to borrow, the only serious criticism that I have to offer to this bill at this time is that, under present conditions and the existing situation, it is not apt.

You on that side are responsible for legislation. I could pick out this and that and the other item, if it stood by itself, that probably ought not to go into this bill. But it is up to that side of the House to consider it. This side of the House is in the minority. We can vote almost any old way [laughter], and if it turns out that this is not a proper thing to do, you have got to take the responsibility. I will say frankly that if I had my way about it I would postpone the passage of this bill until there is a different condition in the Treasury. But if you make up your minds that under all these conditions this bill should be passed, you have the power to pass it with or without the help of the minority.

I think if I were of the majority I would counsel the defeat of this bill at this time without taking time to criticize this thing or that thing or the other thing in connection with it. I expect I am about as anxious as any man in the House that we should avoid a special session. I do not see what we have to gain by it, or what you have to gain by it, or what the country has to gain by it. [Applause.] I would be glad if before this Congress adjourns you will take the proper steps to procure needed revenues by what you call indirect taxation at the customhouse. [Applause on the Republican side.] I will not agree, I apprehend, with the revenue legislation that you are to propose, and I stand for the economic policy of the Republican Party and would procure a large part of the revenue needed, inasmuch as you have not cheapened the cost of living, by proper taxation at the customhouse.

Possibly you will not agree to that proposition; I think probably you will not, if we can trust the newspaper accounts. But, still, whatever provision you make in the near future, whatever bonds shall be issued, whatever Treasury notes bearing 3 per cent shall be issued, I hope you will provide for it. It is to the common interest of all the country. Although your taxation that you may provide is unjust and unwise from my standpoint, yet I hope you will provide it, because it is to the best interest from every standpoint that you should provide for it. That is all I want to say about this bill.



The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The question is on the motion to strike out the paragraph.

The motion was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office and courthouse and other Government offices at Greenwood, S. C., \$125,000; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to sell the present Federal building and site at public sale for cash to the highest bidder, after due advertisement in a newspaper published in the city of Greenwood, S. C., once a week for four successive weeks, conveying the same to the purchaser by the usual quitclaim deed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 20, line 9, after the word "deed," insert the words "and pay the proceeds of such sale into the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the paragraph just read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 20, line 5, after the word "public," strike out the remainder of the line and all of lines 6 and 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "or private sale, but at not less than the value as determined by an appraisal thereof by the Secretary of the Treasury and upon such terms as he may deem for the best interests of the United States."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the committee have no objection to that amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. This amendment is in harmony with the other provision which was adopted.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office, mine rescue station, and other Government offices at Hazard, Ky., \$40,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, strike out lines 15 and 16.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I make this motion with some embarrassment, because this is one of the few items as to which I happen to know who is the Representative offering it. I will say that I have not imputed any unfair motives to any Member in introducing any one of these measures or to the committee in carrying them out. This bill is the only vehicle by which at this time you can get these things. The omnibus bill is responsible for the situation. I will say also to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] that I am not trying to filibuster, nor has there been any such intention of such purpose at any time. We are pointing out specific cases and reasons for opposing particular items, and it would not be fair to the people of this country if we did not state our reasons, because afterwards the question will be offered, "Why did you not point them out?"—the bad items. There are a couple of hundred in this bill that the Treasury Department says are wasteful. I am only discussing a few that are typical of scores in the bill.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. FESS. It is possible that my utterance was misunderstood. I justify any parliamentary method that will put an end to this sort of legislation.

Mr. FREAR. I would not attempt to filibuster, and I never have done so, on this or any other bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will my friend yield?

Mr. FREAR. Certainly; but I want to read the data on this item, and then I will yield to my friend from Kentucky.

In 1910 this town of Hazard, Ky., had a population of 537. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] says it has now increased to 4,000, which I will concede for the sake of argument. The postal receipts for 1915 were \$4,477. For the sake of the argument I will also concede that receipts have now reached more than \$10,000. The Government pays \$250 a year rent, and I will not concede that it pays any more than that, and if such is the case it is a waste of money to compel the Government to pay a cost of maintenance estimated at \$3,800, which is about fifteen times the amount of the rental we have to pay at Hazard.

Now, just a word as to mine interests. There are hundreds of cities in this country that have mine interests, where mine rescue stations might with equal propriety be established. It has been suggested here that the only purpose of a mine-rescue station is to inform people as to proper methods of safeguard and rescue, and that when they have once been educated and trained a permanent building is not needed. Why should there

be a permanent mine-rescue station there any more than at 50 or 100 places in Pennsylvania, or 50 places in Montana or California or other States where they have vast mining interests, particularly in Pennsylvania? Why should not all of these other places have other Governmental activities or mine-rescue stations as well as Hazard?

Mr. LANGLEY. Will my friend permit me to say that at the hearing on this bill the Director of the Bureau of Mines stated fully the reasons why it was necessary to have room in the public building at Hazard for these activities. I have also inserted in the Record his letter to me, to which I invite the gentleman's attention. And let me say further to the gentleman that I acquit him of any intention of imputing any improper motives to anybody. He is simply not fully informed about the conditions in the mountains of eastern Kentucky.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the gentleman. I am informed, however, about the fact that \$250 a year is the amount of annual rent the Government is paying to-day, and we could rent the best building in Hazard for one-quarter the cost of maintenance of the proposed building.

Mr. LANGLEY. If the gentleman will read the testimony which I inserted in the Record he ought to know, and will know, that we can not get insurance on the present building, which is a frame building, and wholly inadequate. It is a regular fire trap, and if it caught fire the building and everything in it would probably be a total loss.

Mr. FREAR. Let us rent the best brick or stone building in the town, which, I am sure, we can do for less than one-quarter of what the cost of maintenance will be.

Mr. LANGLEY. No; we could not. I really think the committee were very stingy with me in not giving Hazard more than \$40,000, and I predict that more money will have to be provided later to afford a suitable building for the rapidly growing needs of Hazard, which is going to be a real metropolis—the "zenith city of the unconquerable mountains"—whence the course of progress in the old Commonwealth is rapidly wending its way, so that the Kentucky mountains will soon be the industrial center of that great region of country. [Applause.] I shall be satisfied for the present with the \$40,000, but I give notice now that I shall ask more in a future Congress. The receipts of the post office will be over \$7,000 this year and twice that in the near future.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office and land office at Lewiston, Mont., \$100,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 11, strike out the word "Lewiston" and insert "Lewistown."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, after line 12, insert the following:

"United States post office at Lewistown, Ill., \$30,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Peru, Ill., \$45,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

Page 23, line 7, strike out the figures "\$45,000" and insert the figures "\$50,000."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to state that the gentleman from Illinois who represents that district called my attention to the fact that we had not allowed as much for that town as to other places throughout the country of that size, and therefore we make this amendment to make it comport with the buildings in other places.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office and other Government offices at Sapulpa, Okla., \$70,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, amend by inserting as line 10 the following language: "United States post office at Schuyler, Nebr., \$35,000."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, that was an item inadvertently left out of the bill. It was agreed upon by the



committee, but in the final draft of the bill, or in the printing, it was omitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the item is printed in the copy of the bill as a committee amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. It is.

The question was considered, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Somerset, Pa., \$58,000.

Mr. HOPWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I know that gentlemen have got tired of this discussion, but I want to take a brief time in which to say something about this item which is in my district. While there is no objection to it, I want to say a word about the small towns. Somerset had a population of 2,700 at the last census, but probably has a population now of 4,000 in the immediate vicinity that makes a part of the town now. The county has 67,000 people and is a going institution. It has increased from 37,000 to 67,000 in the last 20 years.

I took occasion this morning to look up something about Cedar Rapids, Iowa. That matter was up here yesterday, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goop] and other good people are objecting here to appropriations for country towns. I find that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goop] lives in a city that has 32,811 people, but he lives in a county that has 60,720 people; that is, more than half of the people in that county live in his town. The county has only increased in the last 10 years 5,000 people, while the county I am speaking about, Somerset County, has increased 20,000 in the same period. The county he lives in has increased since 1890, 15,000, while the county that I represent has increased 30,000. Somerset County has a larger population than his county, and yet he would object to public buildings in such towns as this, because of their small population, rather than judge the necessity by the population of the county. I think it ought to be based on the population of the county. I think there is where we make a mistake.

The county has not a larger town than Somerset, but there are probably a dozen towns as large as that. Somerset is a magnificent little town and is the county seat. It has a courthouse costing \$250,000 that the people of the county have erected and many other magnificent buildings and dwellings. So I think there is where we are making a mistake, in saying that because a town is a small one it ought not to have a post-office building, when the county may have a larger population and pay more taxes than the county in which Cedar Rapids is located. Cedar Rapids has a public building costing \$350,000, while the public building asked for here is costing only \$58,000, while Somerset County probably pays more taxes and has more population and is a richer county and more of a going institution than the county in which Cedar Rapids is located. Cedar Rapids is dead, the county is dead, and, in fact, Iowa is dead. [Laughter.] Iowa decreased in population 7,000 between the last census and the preceding one. Pennsylvania increased more than 1,300,000 people from 1900 to 1910, and Pennsylvania is a going State. [Applause.]

Now, gentlemen, I regret to say this of Iowa, but they stand up here and object to everything going to Pennsylvania or in any State where there is something doing. I am sick of that sort of thing.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPWOOD. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. What items in Pennsylvania have been objected to?

Mr. HOPWOOD. None that I know of in this particular bill. I refer to other measures. What I want to talk about are the small items for the small towns. I live in a town of 20,000 people—Uniontown; we have no public building; we had \$69,000 in post-office receipts the past year. We are not asking for a Government building. We had a good citizen who built a post-office building which we occupy and which is very comfortable and commodious. This is the only public building I want in my district. I am glad that you have not objected to it. I say we are all wrong about this notion that we ought not to build public buildings in small towns. Why, if you wanted a brick building on a back street in New York you could rent it for one-tenth of what your public building costs there. Would you rent it? No. You would not do it in New York or Chicago. You talk about renting a building cheaper; it is all nonsense. I can rent a house at \$25 a month, but if I am able to pay for it I want a better one than that. I built one that costs me probably \$200 a month to live in, counting interest, taxes, and upkeep. But I do not count the cost of it. That does not enter into it at all. There is a comfort and satisfaction in having your own home that can not be computed in dollars. We have \$200,000,000,000 of wealth in this country. Just at the

present time our income is hardly sufficient to meet the outgo, but that is neither here nor there. We owe only a billion dollars, which is one-half of one per cent of our estimated wealth. What man ever accomplished anything in the world who did not owe more than one-half of 1 per cent? There is not a man before me who has ever accomplished anything in the world that has not owed ten or twenty or fifty times that amount. I say one-half of 1 per cent is nothing. Suppose we add the other half to it and make our indebtedness \$2,000,000,000 and go ahead and erect these buildings, and place them in the little towns, as well as in the big cities; for the little towns have some rights which you are bound to respect. A county that has seventy-five or eighty or a hundred thousand people has some rights even if it has not put its population all in one town. That is all nonsense anyway. We want to scatter the congested population of the cities over the country. We do not want them penned up in one city or town, and you gentlemen are just working to that end, to try and make everybody live next door to his neighbor on a twenty-foot lot. I would rather live out on a twenty-five or fifty acre lot. [Applause.]

I expect to vote for this bill, and if the great metropolitan papers and magazines choose to call it pork when we appropriate \$25,000 or \$50,000 for a public building in a town, and statesmanship of a high order when we appropriate several hundred times that sum for one of our great cities, well and good.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the item stricken out of the bill on page 15.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Equipment shops for the Post Office Department, at Washington, D. C., \$200,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, strike out all of lines 12 and 13.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make that motion because this equipment has already been provided for in the appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office and other Government offices at Weehawken, N. J., \$125,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 15, strike out the word "Weehawken" and insert in lieu thereof the words "town of Union," and after the words "New Jersey," insert the words "for the Weehawken post office."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Albemarle, N. C., \$8,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, strike out lines 24 and 25.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I make this motion for the purpose of calling attention to a new class of items that have now been reached in the bill and not because of any particular objection to this one item, any more than to many that have preceded it and many that will follow. I will give the figures furnished by the Post Office Department for the town of Albemarle, N. C. It has a population of 2,116, and last year had postal receipts of \$8,759. The annual rent paid amounts to \$606. The maintenance charge will reach \$4,900.

Just one moment, now, in reply to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Hopwood] said a few moments ago. He wipes out the whole question of rent with a sweep of the hand, and states that rent is not to be considered. Here is a statement from one of the great departments of the Government, the Post Office Department, and the same is true of the Treasury Department, and the officials are looking for the dollars and cents belonging to the Government, as the gentleman would do if he occupied their positions, because I take it he is a good business man. Here is what the Postmaster General says in the public-building commission's report:

If satisfactory quarters could be rented for an amount less than this [\$1,000], the construction of a public building represents a large annual loss to the Government and should not be authorized.



I submit, Mr. Chairman, that is good policy, whether it is for the individual or for the Government. Now, let me read what relates more particularly to Albemarle.

Mr. HOPWOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. In just a moment. I am trying to give you something besides my individual opinion. On pages 68 and 69 of this report I find the following statement:

It is recommended that sites for public buildings be not authorized in advance of the authorization for the buildings. The estimated cost of sites now authorized is \$11,847,492.30, of which amount there has been appropriated \$5,758,992.30. It is estimated by the Supervising Architect that should buildings be authorized for the sites for which none have yet been provided, at a time which would enable the construction work to be continued without break, that at a rate of progress of 75 buildings per year, the last of the sites authorized will not be improved until about 1922. The adoption of the recommendations of this report will, however, materially increase the present yearly output of buildings.

It is urged that the Government by acquiring a site at an early date reaps the advantage of the increase in value. Sometimes the value does increase, as was the case in Birmingham, Ala., and sometimes the value very greatly decreases, as it did in Pittsburgh, Pa. The site in Pittsburgh was purchased at a cost of \$942,343.91 on May 20, 1907. The public buildings act of 1913 authorized its sale for \$750,000. It would seem that the Government is in exactly the same position as a private purchaser whose real estate investments sometimes increase and at other times decrease. The Government, however, has not the advantage of being able to sell quickly when it finds that property is decreasing in value. It must first go to Congress for an act which will permit the sale. Under the present plan of authorizing sites in advance of buildings the Government is required to carry several million dollars of nonincome-producing real estate for from two to six years.

Then the statement goes on to advise against the policy of purchasing sites in advance. I would suggest that a great majority of the preceding items in the bill are in this same list of wasteful proposals. However, there is no desire to obstruct legislation here or to unnecessarily occupy time. Items are asked to be stricken out whenever specific cases arise where particular rules should be applied. Other items are frequently equally bad. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOPWOOD. If rental is to be the criterion in this matter, does the gentleman not know that in any city in this land where we have expended millions of dollars to build a Government building, we could rent quarters for perhaps one-tenth of the amount?

Mr. FREAR. It is true in many cases, I believe; but I will say this: That where we have cited case after case where we are paying ten times as much for maintenance as we are for rental, it is very poor policy for either a Government or a private individual to adopt such a course. Such is the advice of this report given after great study on the subject by those who represent the Government's interests.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Baxley, Ga., \$5,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out this item, because from the report it appears that the population at the last census was 831 at Baxley. I do not know where it is located or who is its Representative. The post-office receipts were \$6,639 last year, only that amount; \$408 is the annual rental at Baxley, and \$4,200 is more than ten times the rental now paid. That is for the average building maintenance cost that will be incurred in a place of that kind. I submit that is one of the items which seems poor business economy for the Government to engage in, particularly at this time. It is profligate waste.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Blakely, Ga., \$6,000.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. The population of Blakely, Ga., in 1910 was 1,838. The postal receipts on January 1 last were \$6,327.50. At present the Government is paying nothing for rent. The cost of maintenance of the new building will be \$4,400. I wish to read regarding this matter of buying sites, from page 68 of the report of the Public Buildings Commission. This Public Building Committee was a very distinguished commission, consisting of the following:

#### PUBLIC BUILDINGS COMMISSION.

Hon. William G. McAdoo, Secretary of the Treasury, chairman; Hon. James C. McReynolds, Attorney General; Hon. Albert S. Bursleson, Postmaster General; Senator CLAUDE A. SWANSON; Senator GEORGE SUTHERLAND; Representative FRANK CLARK; Representative RICHARD W. AUSTIN; Sherman Allen, assistant to the chairman; Jay F. Durham, secretary.

In many instances the authorization for the purchase of the site has been made a commitment—

Mr. CRAMTON. If I may interrupt the gentleman at that point. A few minutes ago the gentleman referred to a rule, sponsored by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, with reference to debate upon the bill. Was that a different rule from the rule under which we are proceeding?

Mr. JAMES. It was.

Mr. CRAMTON. I would ask if the gentleman would, in extending his remarks, insert the rule to which he referred. I am not asking him to read it here.

Mr. JAMES. The rule, as introduced by the committee, provided for two hours' debate to be controlled by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] and two hours by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] at the end of which time general debate would close, and the only amendments which may be offered may be committee amendments. There would be no discussion of other amendments, and no one but a member of the committee could offer an amendment or even talk on any amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman kindly insert the rule in his extension?

Mr. JAMES. I shall be pleased to do so. The full rule, which is House Rule No. 400, reads as follows:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 17052) to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, etc.; that in the committee the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with; that there shall be not to exceed two hours of general debate to be under the control of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] and two hours of general debate to be under the control of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], said debate to be confined to the subject matter of the bill; that at the conclusion of the general debate the bill shall be read by paragraphs for committee amendments and no others; that at the conclusion of such reading the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, whereupon the previous question shall be considered as ordered upon the bill and amendments to final passage.

Page 68 of the report of the Public Buildings Commission goes on, as follows:

In many instances the authorization for the purchase of a site has been made as a commitment on the part of the Government to the ultimate erection of a public building. Since towns and cities often change rapidly, especially in the West, in increase or decrease, this has many disadvantages. This was the case at Goldfield, Nev., where a site and building was authorized May 30, 1908, at a cost of \$75,000, but has not yet been erected—

At that time Goldfield had a population of about 18,000, and in 1910 it had, I understand, about 5,000. And, I may say, the Government has not even seen fit to buy the site—

There can be scarcely any advantage in the practice to the Government unless it be that the early authorization permits the acquiring of title in ample time for building operations. The acquiring of the title by the Government takes an average of six months to nine months.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Charleston, Mo., \$5,000.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 10, after the word "office," insert the words "and other Government offices."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. There is no objection to that.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Corvallis, Oreg., \$10,000.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 20, strike out the period and insert a comma and add: "And for the erection of a post-office building, \$60,000."

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, Corvallis is a substantial, well-built, prosperous, modern city. It is situated in a fertile, populous, farming section; is the county seat of Benton County and the seat of the Oregon Agricultural College. The enterprising citizens of Corvallis believe that a public building is greatly needed there, because of the inadequacy of the present postal facilities, the location of the post office at one side of the town, and for other reasons which I will give a little later. They earnestly desire that provision be made in the pending bill for a building for that city. All requirements are fully met. The bill carries an appropriation of \$10,000 for the acquisition of a site.

The amendment I have offered provides for the construction of a building upon the site at a cost of \$60,000.



The postal receipts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, were \$27,176.15, and for the first six months of the present fiscal year were \$13,749.54. The receipts are nearly three times the minimum requirement.

Prior to January 17, 1917, the rent paid was \$1,260, but on January 18, 1917, the rent was increased to \$1,800 per annum. This increase indicates the normal steady increase of rental values, due to the growth of the city; and rent charges will continually increase.

Under date of March 23, 1912, the Corvallis Business Men's Association estimated the population as 7,400. Taking into consideration the growth of the city and its environs directly served from the post office, the present population is much larger.

By the time a building authorized in this bill is ready for occupancy the receipts in the Corvallis office will be from \$35,000 to \$40,000 or more and the population served over 10,000.

The Oregon Agricultural College, located here, has a plant valued at over \$2,500,000 and a very large attendance. The business of the college, that of its student body, and of parents who move in to send their children to the college increase the revenues of the office, as well as add to the demands on the post office now inadequate for proper service.

I think this showing clearly establishes the necessity and propriety of the amendment I have offered. I trust the distinguished chairman of the committee will see his way clear to indorse the amendment, and that the committee will adopt it. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I certainly will have to object to the amendment. There is no question that Corvallis, Oreg., is in the condition of hundreds of others. It is utterly impossible to take care of another place in the gentleman's district. We have provided a site at Corvallis, and that was all the committee thought in good conscience the bill at that time could provide for that place. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Covington, Ga., \$5,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 21, insert "United States post office at Crosby, N. Dak., \$5,000."

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Hartsville, S. C., \$5,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 6, insert the following: "United States post office at Harvard, Ill., \$10,000."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Henderson, Tex., \$5,000.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section. The postal receipts were \$6,666. The present rent of the building is \$300. Its maintenance now will be \$3,400. On page 68, referring to this matter of sites, the postal commission states:

It is recommended that sites for public buildings be not authorized in advance of the authorization for the buildings. The estimated cost of sites now authorized is \$11,847,492.30, of which amount there has been appropriated \$5,758,992.30. It is estimated by the Supervising Architect that should buildings be authorized for the sites for which none have yet been provided, at a time which would enable the construction work to be continued without break, that at a rate of progress of 75 buildings per year the last of the sites authorized will not be improved until about 1922. The adoption of the recommendations of this report will, however, materially increase the present yearly output of buildings.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Kansas City, Mo., \$1,000,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the committee, offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, between lines 18 and 19, insert:

"United States post office at Klamath Falls, Oreg., \$10,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

There has been so much criticism about different items in this bill that I think it is possibly due at this time to say something about necessary items. The last item we have just passed over was for the purchase of the site at Kansas City. The committee will observe it was only for a post office, and yet, of course, there are a great many Government activities in Kansas City. The fact about the matter is this: The present building in Kansas City, which is used for the post office and customhouse and United States courts, and so on, was completed in 1900. It cost a total of a little over \$1,500,000, including the site. To-day the site could be sold for more money than the building and site cost, if the Government chose to dispose of it.

When I first looked into this matter in 1910, and it became apparent that we needed more space for post-office activities in Kansas City, we exhausted every device of the Supervising Architect's Office to see whether we could not enlarge that post-office building and keep up with the postal growth in Kansas City. We found it was utterly impossible to do so. When that building was completed in 1900 the postal receipts of Kansas City were \$600,000. The last fiscal year they were over \$3,000,000. There has been an increase of 500 per cent in 16 years, and the department found it was utterly impossible to enlarge the building upon the present site and keep pace with the growth of the postal business of the Southwest.

Now, of course you understand that the business done in Kansas City in a postal way embraces 1,500 miles of territory. Not only that, but it is the center of a very large territory of Government activities. For instance, the new grain-grading department has an office there, the United States courts and the Department of Justice, with its white-slave prosecutions and habit-forming drug prosecutions, is located there, and the office of the special examiners of the Pension Office is located there. In addition to that, we have the Interstate Commerce Commission, with its valuation of the railroads in 12 different States. We have the River and Harbor Board, which occupies an entire floor of the building. I found the Government was paying \$50,000 a year rent outside of the present building for Government quarters and was facing a payment of \$2,000 or \$3,000 in the immediate future for additional rent. It will soon reach an amount of about \$55,000 annually outside of the present building. That presented a situation, with the growth of the parcel post and the blue-tag mail and the wide distribution of territory over which it must be distributed from Kansas City, that appealed to the Secretary of the Treasury as a typical point at which to illustrate a new line of departure in Government buildings. I know the committee will be interested in the solution of this problem.

We propose now to use the uptown office, the one that is now used as a post office and customhouse, exclusively for customhouse, United States court, and United States offices, with a small branch post office for down-town purposes. We propose to buy a site under this bill adjacent to the new Union Station, where all of the 21 different railroads that reach Kansas City enter. We propose to use that building purely as an office building. It will not be a Greek temple, it will not be purely an ornamental structure, but it will have all the floor space that can possibly be built upon that amount of ground. It will be an office such as any business man here would build for business purposes. It will be as much a business building as are built by the express companies adjacent to the railroad companies for their business. We expect to have all the receipts of the mails taken to that building direct from the train, as they are in New York or Washington. We expect the distribution of some 50 or 60 substations to be made there, including Kansas City, Kans., which has 100,000 people, across the line. We expect all the collections of the mail to be brought in there and loaded on the cars. We do not expect to move the blue-tag mail at all.

Mr. FREAR. Where is this?

Mr. BORLAND. At Kansas City, and adjacent to the Union Station.

I will explain that idea. When the Secretary of the Treasury came out there with the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Newton, he came for the express purpose of seeing if that plan was feasible; and in his annual report he mentioned this plan as a new one that the Government proposed to follow in all cases where terminal stations were possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. The Government instead of trying to build a monumental structure in some place in the congested downtown, high-priced district intends in this case—and, I think, in



several typical cases in the future—to go adjacent to the railroad track and build a purely business building, a building which will embrace all the working space that it is possible to get for the appropriation, and with the amount of ground; and it proposes to use all of that space for the transaction of Government business. The saving will be not only a saving in rent by moving the uptown office and using that for Government offices now being housed elsewhere but the saving will be in the transportation of the mail to and from the uptown office—a very large item—and the saving will also be in time of the collection and distribution of the mail. So that the mail going out from Kansas City over that territory of the Southwest will be more rapidly handled than it ever has been handled before.

Now, we are coming to a time when the parcel post will cut a large figure in the mail distribution. I can not conceive how in any great city like Kansas City or Chicago or any central mailing points we can very long continue to collect the parcel post at a central downtown office. I think we will have in all cases that have not terminal post offices, offices which will be devoted to the heavy, bulky mail, and at which the collection and distribution of the mail will occur. If this plan is carried out and made a success, as I am confident it will be, it will set an example for a reform in office buildings for the Government. It will be, so far as I know, outside of New York City, the first business building devoted wholly to postal purposes of the United States. That is the occasion for our making this only for a post office. The other activities then will be housed in the old building, and the old building will be devoted to Government offices that are now needed in that city.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. The building referred to by the gentleman, in New York City, erected by the Government, adjoining the Pennsylvania Terminal Station, was opened to the public some seven years ago. It was authorized in the Post Office appropriation bill some 10 years back, and yet the Post Office Department approved of that character of accommodation for the disposal and handling of the mail in a large city, but we do not find it being duplicated in any other city during these 10 years except now in the recommendation carried in this bill for Kansas City.

Mr. BORLAND. Well, I will say to the gentleman that whatever has been done elsewhere, I studied this situation from the local and national standpoint, and took it up with the department officers, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Assistant Secretary, and the Supervising Architect, and we arrived at a plan in Kansas City that I am willing to stand on before this House.

Mr. STAFFORD. In this instance is not the delay occasioned to this much-needed reform in the handling of the mail in our large cities due to the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury has this in charge rather than the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General, who is in direct control of the disposition of the postal needs of the country?

Mr. BORLAND. I think not.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman would study the conditions, the proof will show that it is so.

Mr. BORLAND. I will answer the gentleman. Whenever a recommendation is made for a building it is referred to the Postmaster General.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BORLAND. In a moment. The gentleman will find in the report here a recommendation from the Postmaster General which follows exactly what I am describing here.

Mr. STAFFORD. The location of the site in these public buildings is never referred to the Postmaster General.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Lewisburg, Pa., \$10,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in line 4, page 30. I offer an amendment to strike out the figures "\$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$16,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 30, line 4, by striking out "\$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$16,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment printed in the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 30, strike out line 7.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Manning, S. C., \$5,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the item, Manning, S. C.; and I only speak of this because it is one among many others that have small receipts—had a population of 1,854 souls in 1910. The postal receipts last year were \$5,435.28. The annual rental is \$550. The proposed annual maintenance, as estimated by the Treasury Department, reaches \$4,000; in other words, eight times the present rental will be the cost.

While speaking about this item, which is only one of many items that we have, I want to call attention to the last item which was read, which I did not move to strike out because there was no particular object in so doing. At Mangum, Okla., the annual rental paid by the Government is \$121, whereas the department estimates that the cost of the building to be maintained in that town would be \$4,800 a year, or forty times as much as the Government is now paying at Mangum, Okla. Think of that for a building investment by the Government!

I am speaking more particularly, however, as to Manning, S. C., where the receipts are only a little over \$5,000, according to this report. Many of the places we have passed have only \$5,000 or \$6,000 annual receipts, and are far below the \$10,000 which is supposed to govern such items.

Mr. WHALEY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. FREAR. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. WHALEY. Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a statement from the Post Office authorities, in which they say the receipts last year at Manning were \$5,846.33, instead of \$5,435.28, as the gentleman from Wisconsin stated. It also shows that during the last four quarters the post-office receipts there were \$6,217, showing that this post office falls within the rule that has been established by the committee—that it would grow into the class where a building would be allowed. The report of the receipts for the last quarter is \$1,630.35. Manning is situated in one of the most prosperous sections of my State, in the cotton and tobacco belt.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield further. I want to conclude my statement.

Mr. WHALEY. I thought you had yielded the floor.

Mr. FREAR. No; only to the gentleman for a question. I do not concede that \$6,000 is a proper amount. I admit that the gentleman is within the rule from what he says, but I do not believe it can be justified in any case.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at O'Neill, Nebr., \$6,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment by Mr. CLARK of Florida: Page 31, line 16, after the word "office," insert the words "and land office."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office and other Government offices at Owenton, Ky., \$7,500.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. FREAR. This item, which I move to strike out, is, according to the statement I have before me, for a village of 1,024 people in 1910, and the annual receipts, according to the statement, the last report, were \$4,368.68. The annual rental is \$440.



The estimated cost of maintenance was \$4,300—about ten times the amount of rental.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman a question solely for information.

Mr. FREAR. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have noticed that every time one of these smaller items is called up here the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] or the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES] would say that the receipts of the post office were \$4,000 or \$6,000, or whatever the amount was, that the rent was \$300, that the cost of the building was \$30,000 or \$40,000, and that the annual expense of keeping up one of these small post offices will be \$4,000 a year. How does the Secretary of the Treasury or anybody else figure that out?

Mr. FREAR. I inquired about that, and I was informed that they average the maintenance from the character of buildings that are ordinarily placed in towns of that size; and, as I understand from the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, a standardization for a building of that type is to be attempted.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How can they figure it out? What are the items included in maintenance?

Mr. FREAR. I have them all here, as furnished by the department. I placed the items which go to make up estimates for maintenance in my speech several days ago for every project.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not arguing either for or against this bill; but I want to know how they get at these figures.

Mr. FREAR. I understand.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Government of the United States can borrow all the money it wants at 3 per cent, and I believe the public debt of the United States can be refunded at 2 per cent or 1½ per cent, or even 1 per cent, if you will make the time long enough in the bond. Now, 3 per cent on \$40,000, for instance, would be only \$1,200 a year.

Mr. FREAR. That is one item.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How do they get the rest of that \$4,000?

Mr. FREAR. The items have all been set forth. There is, next, janitor service—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They ought to cut out the janitor service.

Mr. FREAR. But they do not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We ought to put a provision in this bill that these small post-office buildings shall not have a janitor. [Applause.]

Mr. FREAR. Then, in addition to that item, they figure depreciation, just the same as on any ordinary business proposition. Then comes the supplies, which I believe the chairman of the committee stated would be \$800 or \$900.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the gentleman will permit, I do not want to take up his time, but I have studied about this thing a good deal. A small post office in a small town ought not to be allowed a janitor.

Mr. BURNETT. They do not have them in the rented post offices.

Mr. LANGLEY. I do not think they have them in all the Government-owned buildings.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They do not have them in the towns where they rent post offices now?

Mr. LANGLEY. No.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It ought to be easier to keep a Government-owned building clean—that is, properly arranged for the business—than it is one of these rented stores.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. I should like to inquire of the Speaker whose duty would it be to keep a Government-owned building clean?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The postmaster's.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is not a part of his duties.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why isn't it? It is a part of his duties now.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is not included in his salary.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not see why it should cost more to keep a Government-owned building clean than it does to keep one of these rented buildings clean.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think generally where they have rented quarters it is provided in the lease that the landlord shall keep the building clean.

MANY MEMBERS. Oh, no!

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Where they have rented quarters, the Government employees keep the building clean. I wish the chairman of this committee, or somebody else, would put

into this bill a provision that these small post-office buildings in small towns shall not have janitors.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. We are going to offer an amendment to that effect before we get through.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You will perform a service to the country if you do.

Mr. FREAR. Here is a letter from the Treasury Department right in line with what the Speaker has suggested. It says:

The department estimate for a building at a place of this size, and of similar postal receipts, for post-office purposes only, would probably be \$25,000 for the building itself and \$5,000 for the site. It is estimated that to furnish the building would require \$3,000 additional, making a total outlay of \$33,000.

Calculating 3 per cent on this investment, the interest charge would be \$990.

I submit, however, in that connection, that when we pay income taxes we are paying at the rate of 6 per cent, because money is worth that to the individual, and we are taxing the people of this country indirectly to-day at the rate of 6 per cent. That is what it means to the average man to help pay for these buildings, that is what his income tax pays for. The letter from the Treasury Department continues:

The yearly depreciation of the building and furniture, together with the approximate cost of annual repairs, would amount to 2½ per cent on the amount invested in the project, exclusive of cost of site, viz: on \$28,000, which would be \$700.

Then it goes on and discusses about the different items. Now, let me make one more brief statement with regard to this. The distinguished Speaker of the House asked me a question. I want to say this, that I regretted very much the other day when I noticed in a paper a statement about an item in this bill which I think is probably better than many of the other items.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman has mentioned that, I should like to make one statement about it. I think that unnecessary buildings should be left off, and I hope there will be a fixed rule adopted with reference to public buildings, providing that when the postal receipts and other conditions reach a certain point, a town shall be entitled automatically to a public building. But one of the big papers, the New York Times, had an editorial on this subject, and in order to have a basis to say something about it, they doubled the amount, deliberately, as to building in my home town. It could not have been an accident. The proposed appropriation for the post office in my town is \$40,000. That is all I asked for, and the committee gave it to me, but that paper stated in the middle of a long editorial that it was \$80,000. That is the way they try to build up public opinion against these things.

Mr. FREAR. If the gentleman will allow me, I will say that it was a clerical mistake. In one part of my speech it was correctly stated at \$40,000. I did not know it referred to the Speaker's home town. At another place in my speech it appeared as \$80,000. I was not aware of it. The Times stated its editorial was based upon figures taken from my speech of December 7. They seem to have taken the wrong figures, which resulted from a clerical error in one place that had been overlooked.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not know that they had ever quoted the gentleman's speech. They had an independent editorial into which they dragged me, and they said it was \$80,000. Now, I will tell you about that, while I am at it. Conditions have changed there in six or seven years. And when the census was taken of that town the last time there was a gouge of 500 in population—accidentally or purposely—I do not know which. We offered to pay the expenses of the Government for retaking the census of that town, but they would not do it. It was that way all over the country. But it did one good thing; the apparent loss of population stirred the people of that town up so that they went to work and built four graveled roads in addition to the ones they had. There have been 200 houses built in that town since that census was taken. But these old figures give the census as it was taken. Now they are disposing of stock to build a sanitarium costing \$250,000 in that town, and yet we are held to the figures of six or seven years ago.

If you take the new system of rural routes and improved roads by building gravel roads—and in addition to the three that we had we have built four more—it extends the service of that particular post office many miles by abolishing the small country crossroads post offices. So if you take the old figures and stick to them you are deceiving the public.

Another thing. The Census Office not long ago issued a statement as to the present population in cities. How did they do it? They took the growth of those cities from 1900 to 1910, just as if the growth of these cities and towns were an absolutely fixed quantity in the Census Office. Of course, there is no sort of



common sense in it. One town may have 75 reasons for growing while another town of the same size has no reason at all.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that we have towns that showed no postal receipts at all in 1905, and to-day they show postal receipts of \$20,000.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The postal receipts in the town in which I live are growing at the rate of \$1,000 a year. They now amount to nearly \$11,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Ozark, Ala., \$5,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 21, after line 19, insert: "United States post office at Palo Alto, Cal., \$15,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Rich Hill, Mo., \$5,000.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have no desire to take up the time of the House at this time, and I make this motion merely for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to extend my remarks upon this item and other items in the bill, and the bill generally.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

Mr. VARE. I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MOORE, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. VARE, ask unanimous consent to extend their remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 32, after line 13, insert: "United States post office at Roanoke, Ala., \$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office and other Government offices at San Jose, Cal., \$15,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 32, strike out lines 24 and 25.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, in explanation of that I want to state that the committee just adopted an amendment on page 31 fixing a site at Palo Alto, and it was a mistake to insert San Jose.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Sheffield, Ala., \$5,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 33, after line 6, insert: "United States post office at Spencer, W. Va., \$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 6. That the provision in the public-building act approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stats., p. 888), for the enlargement, extension, remodeling, repairing, or improvement upon the present site and the enlarged site of the Federal building at Utica, N. Y., at a cost not exceeding \$365,000, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to the item of Oakland, Cal., page 14, so that the gentleman from California [Mr. Elston] may offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to return to page 14. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, we want first to hear the amendment read.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to state before it is read that this amendment which the gentleman from California desires to offer will result in saving \$50,000 to the Government. Let the amendment be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 16 and 17 on page 14 and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to contract for the acquisition by purchase, condemnation or otherwise, of a new site and for the erection and completion thereon of a suitable building, including fireproof vaults, mechanical equipment, and approaches complete, together with such mail-handling apparatus, etc., as he may deem advisable, for the use and accommodation of the post office and other governmental offices at Oakland, Cal., at a cost not exceeding \$1,000,000.

"And that the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, upon the completion and occupancy of said new building, to sell the present public building and the site thereof in Oakland, Cal., at such time, in such manner, and upon such terms as he may deem advisable: to convey such property to the purchaser thereof by the usual quitclaim deed; and to deposit the proceeds of said sale in the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have some explanation of this item before consent is given. This is no five or ten thousand dollar item, but is such an amount that would make a pretty big hole in the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to returning to page 14?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am still reserving the right to object.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am proposing this amendment in accordance with the recommendations of a letter addressed by the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo, to the Speaker of the House, as contained in House Document 1776, second session, Sixty-fourth Congress. On his recent visit to California the Secretary of the Treasury inspected the post-office situation in Oakland. He examined the site there and decided that a new building there at a cost of \$650,000 was inadvisable upon the present site, because of the size of the lot. He looked about and found that a site could be secured in the vicinity for an amount less than the amount the present site could be sold for. The present post-office building was erected about 20 years ago at a total combined cost for site and building of \$250,000. The present site alone can be sold for \$450,000, conservatively speaking, so that if this amendment is adopted the net result will be a saving to the Government of \$50,000. As a matter of fact, if this amendment be adopted it will not only save the Government \$50,000 but will afford a whole block as a post-office site, instead of only a portion of a block.

In this connection I insert herewith the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury to the Speaker:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, December 16, 1916.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: The attention of Congress is respectfully invited to the Federal building at Oakland, Cal. The public-buildings act of March 4, 1913, authorized a much needed extension, remodeling, etc., of this building, and the acquisition of additional land necessary to accomplish this purpose.

In order to obtain the required land it became necessary to institute condemnation proceedings, and these resulted in an award of damages amounting to \$51,750 more than the entire amount provided in the aforesaid act for both the extension work and the land. The act of March 3, 1915, provided this additional amount for a site, but having expended the entire sum authorized for land nothing remains for the work upon the building.

Bills (H. R. 10834 and S. 4276) are now pending in Congress providing for the construction of a new building at a limit of cost of \$1,000,000.

The reports of this department submitted to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, under date of March 21, 1916, estimated that an adequate building could be constructed for \$650,000, and the pending public-buildings bill (H. R. 17052) provides for the construction of a post office and customhouse at Oakland, Cal., at the limit estimated, i. e., \$650,000.

Recent investigations at Oakland indicate that it would be to the advantage of the Government to dispose of the present site and building and secure a new site in a better location and at a less permanent investment than is involved with the present site.

Land in the immediate vicinity of the present location of the Federal building has materially increased in value, and it is believed that the present site could be sold for from \$400,000 to \$450,000 if prompt action could be taken in the matter. It is probable also that a new site occupying a whole square could be secured for about \$270,000. The advantages of a site having four street frontages over the present one with two such frontages and an alley are manifest.

The present building is not adapted to enlargement or development along the best lines, and with an entire new site the Government would be able to construct a new building much better suited to provide for the present requirements of Oakland and for its future growth.

It is therefore recommended that existing legislation be amended so as to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, to acquire a new site and erect thereon a new building at a limit of cost not exceeding \$1,000,000, and upon the completion of the new building that the present site and building be disposed of.

A draft of the legislation necessary to accomplish the purposes indicated is transmitted herewith.

Respectfully,

W. G. McAdoo, Secretary.

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of the public-buildings act, approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stats., 869), as authorized the enlargement, extension, remodeling, rebuilding, reconstruction, or improvement of the United States post office and customhouse at Oakland, Cal., be, and the same is hereby, amended as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to contract for the acquisition by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of a new site, and for the erection and completion thereon of a suitable building, including fireproof vaults, mechanical equipment, and approaches, complete, together with such mail-handling apparatus, etc., as he may deem advisable, for the use and accommodation of the post office and other governmental offices at Oakland, Cal., at a cost of not exceeding \$1,000,000.



"And that the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, upon the completion and occupancy of said new building, to sell the present public building and the site thereof in Oakland, Cal., at such time, in such manner, and upon such terms as he may deem advisable; to convey such property to the purchaser thereof by the usual quitclaim deed; and to deposit the proceeds of said sale in the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from California [Mr. ELSTON] has made out a good case. I have no objection to returning to the item at a later time in the consideration of the bill, but I wish to suggest that the phraseology contained in the amendment proposed is not the phraseology that the committee has adopted, so far as the sale of property is concerned. If the gentleman will temporarily withdraw his amendment, so that we can make a change to conform to the practice of the committee, I will have no objection, and I now ask unanimous consent that we may return to this item for that purpose.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I will say that the wording which I have adopted in my amendment is the exact wording suggested by the Secretary of the Treasury in his report.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. But the committee has agreed on phraseology covering this class of cases. I ask unanimous consent that later on, when the amendment is perfected, we may return to this page for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to withdraw his request temporarily.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. And permission also to later on return to this page.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to sell to the highest bidders at public or private sale, in such manner and upon such terms as he may deem to be to the best interests of the United States, the United States warehouse site at San Juan, P. R., except so much of said property as he may deem advisable to retain for the use of any branch of the public service, to convey such property to the purchasers thereof by the usual quitclaim deeds, and to deposit the proceeds of such sale in the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Is this warehouse at San Juan right upon the harbor?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I rather think it is. I am not positive about that. The Treasury Department wants to sell it, because they have no use for it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I notice that this section would leave it to the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury to sell this property at public or private sale in such manner and upon such terms as he may deem to be to the best interest of the United States. That would permit him to sell it to any steamboat company which now has terminals there, would it not?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; it would permit him to sell it to any person, I suppose—to the highest bidder at public or private sale.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. This matter of securing proper terminal facilities on water fronts like this is getting to be of the most serious importance; indeed, to some shippers it is, in their business, of vital importance. If the Secretary of the Treasury can sell that United States warehouse to a steamship company which already has a terminal down there, and upon any terms which he pleases, it may be that the sale will establish there a sort of monopoly of wharf privileges. We had something of this kind up once some years ago about a sale or proposed sale by the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, of wharf property belonging to the Government and situated in Alaska. The House refused to permit it when an objection similar to that I am making was made in that case. I do not think that we ought to sell Government wharf property except when absolutely necessary, and it will practically never be necessary. The city of New York has had to acquire private wharves and make them public at great expense. Other cities have had a similar experience.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin is correct about that. The Government should not part with title to any property on a water front that may be used as a terminal, because the tendency now is to monopolize sites by private interests, which cuts out independent interests and competition.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It enables one set of shippers if they get in with a vessel company, to coerce other shippers, to deprive them of fair facilities, to destroy equitable and just competition. As I said a moment ago, this matter of securing water-front terminals is getting to be a question not only of serious but, in a commercial sense, of vital importance to mu-

nicipalities. No man ought to be permitted to sell—especially not at private sale—wharf frontage belonging to the Government of the United States to any private steamship company that he may chance to get an offer from. I ask that we pass this item until there is opportunity to look further into it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have sent for the letter which the Secretary wrote to the Speaker. I ask unanimous consent that we pass over this item temporarily until we can get that information.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. With the privilege of returning to it later.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to pass over this item temporarily, with the privilege of returning to it later. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the first paragraph of section 11.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Are amendments to be offered at the end of the paragraph or after the section has been read?

The CHAIRMAN. After the paragraph.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will it be in order now to offer an amendment to this paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 38, at the end of line 15, add the following: "Upon the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby empowered and directed to clear said squares."

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TILSON. And that is whether this portion of the bill should not be read by sections. For instance, this section relating to the building for the Department of Justice, if read and amended by paragraph, might put us in the ridiculous position of being unable to go back to some previous part of the section which ought to be changed if some later portion of the section is changed. It seems to me it ought to be read by sections, otherwise it can not be intelligently amended.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the entire section be read, if the gentleman will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do; and that is the reason I asked the question.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the section will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 11. That a commission, consisting of the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Attorney General, be, and is hereby, created, with full power and authority to obtain, through competition, under such conditions as the commission may prescribe, or from an architect specially selected by said commission, such designs, plans, estimates, specifications, etc., and such modifications therein as may be necessary, in connection with the construction of a suitable fireproof building, hereby authorized to be erected in the city of Washington, D. C., for the Department of Justice.

That payment for the architectural services hereinbefore authorized shall be made from the appropriation for the building for the Department of Justice, at such prices or rates of compensation as may be fixed by said commission, not in excess, however, of the customary and prevailing rates for similar services; and said commission is hereby authorized to enter into contract to such extent as it may deem necessary for such architectural services, or to delegate its authority to enter into such contract to the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as including the superintendence or local supervision of the work of constructing said building as a part of the architectural services hereinbefore authorized.

That the limit of cost of said Department of Justice Building, with fireproof vaults, elevators, equipment, and furnishings, ready for occupancy, and including compensation for architectural and other expert technical and clerical services, but exclusive of approaches and apparatus for generating electric current and heat, shall not exceed the sum of \$3,000,000.

That said Department of Justice Building shall be located upon such portions of squares 226 and 227 immediately south of Pennsylvania Avenue between Fourteenth and Fifteenth Streets northwest as may be designated by the above-named commission.

That upon the approval of the designs, plans, and so forth, and the designation of the location as aforesaid, by said commission, the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to enter into contracts for the construction, equipment, and furnishing of the said Department of Justice Building, and to employ such expert technical and clerical services as he may deem necessary and specially order in writing, to be employed exclusively in the Office of the Commissioner of Public Buildings in connection with the work on said building, all within the total limit of cost hereinbefore fixed: *Provided*, That the contracts for the furnishings for said building shall be made for only such articles as may be approved by the Attorney General.

That the adoption and approval of the design, plans, and so forth, for said Department of Justice Building by the above-named commission shall not prevent subsequent changes in the design, arrangement, materials, or methods of construction, or cost which may be found necessary or advantageous: *Provided*, That no changes shall be made involving an expense in excess of the limit of cost hereinbefore fixed.



That for the payment of architectural and other expert technical and clerical services and necessary expenses in obtaining designs, plans, estimates, specifications, and so forth, and for beginning the construction of said Department of Justice Building, the sum of \$500,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as in any wise interfering with or violating any agreement heretofore made by the Treasury Department with any architect or architects with relation to the drafting of plans for a Department of Justice Building, but any such agreement, if it exists, shall in good faith be carried out.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I now offer my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

On page 38, at the end of line 15, add the following: "upon the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby empowered and directed to clear said squares."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the chairman of the committee accepts the amendment. This amendment simply asks that the special commission to be appointed under the bill shall take the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts. I think it is to be regretted that the Commission of Fine Arts bears that name, because in the minds of some people the name conveys the idea that the commission are given to things not worth while, that they run to the purely ornamental. But this impression is altogether a wrong one. The commission has already rendered the Government, especially by its work for the city of Washington, services of inestimable value. Its members are among the most eminent, if, indeed, they themselves are not the most eminent, men in their respective professions in America to-day. They serve without personal compensation of any kind, being reimbursed only for their official traveling expenses, and then only in part for those. They give many days of their time and experience to the Government throughout the year freely and without stint, mainly because of patriotic pride in the best development of the National Capital and Government art in general. Their services have resulted in a direct saving of large sums of money to the United States, as, for instance, where experts formerly had to be employed and paid to give decisions in such matters as now come before the Fine Arts body officially, and the further economy in seeing that the United States through funds appropriated by the Committees on Appropriation of Congress gets absolutely the best possible artistic results for its money. All their efforts are in the direction of simplicity and dignity and against expenditures of public funds for unnecessary elaboration and adornment in public buildings, monuments, and other pieces of sculpture, paintings, and the like.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I will.

Mr. BARNHART. Who constitutes this Commission of Fine Arts and who appoints them?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The President.

Mr. BARNHART. How many members is it composed of?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do not know just how many are architects. One member is a famous landscape artist, Mr. Frederick Law Olmsted. At one time Mr. McKim, of McKim, Mead & White, of New York, and Mr. Daniel Burnham, of Chicago, two of the very foremost architects in the United States, and Mr. Augustus St. Gaudens, one of the most eminent sculptors in the world, were members of the commission, and gave their services to the Government.

Mr. BARNHART. Does the gentleman think that a commission of that sort ought to have charge of the jurisdiction over the construction of an ordinary business building, like the post-office building or a court building, all over the country?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. This amendment has nothing to do with post-office buildings or courthouses. It relates only to the national Department of Justice Building in the city of Washington, to be at the head of Pennsylvania Avenue, diagonally across from the Treasury, in almost, if not quite, the most conspicuous site in the city.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. My impression was that site was reserved for a building to be erected to house the Department of State.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. No. The gentleman from Wisconsin has the two just reversed. The Department of State, according to the plans, was to be housed on the square just at the Mall; I will ask the gentleman from Illinois—

Mr. MANN. I can not say.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes; it was. The plan provides also that the Department of Justice Building shall be practically on a line with the District of Columbia Building as this now stands. And between the Department of Justice Building, on

the Avenue, and that of the Department of State, on the Mall, is to be a building for another of the departments.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I will yield.

Mr. BORLAND. I did not understand the portion of the gentleman's amendment which says the Secretary of the Treasury shall have the site cleared. Why is that necessary?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. You can not erect a building where those other structures stand until these have been removed.

Mr. BORLAND. I understand that; but the Government owns the ground now and they have a right to have the site cleared when they get ready to build a building.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The Government owns the property, but the Secretary of the Treasury has no authority to tear down the buildings on it unless Congress shall authorize him to do so. The ownership and control are in the Government, not in the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. BORLAND. The Government designates certain officers for the construction of a new building on an old site, and part of it would be preparing the site for the construction of the building. I do not see where the gentleman separates the two.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I will.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman recall just how the first part of his amendment reads? Upon the advice of the Fine Arts Commission?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes; upon the advice of the commission.

Mr. MANN. That is offered as an amendment to a paragraph fixing the site of the building. I suppose the gentleman wants to put in a requirement that the plans for the building shall meet the approval of the Fine Arts Commission?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The language of this paragraph is:

That said Department of Justice building shall be located upon such portions of squares 226 and 227 immediately south of Pennsylvania Avenue between Fourteenth and Fifteenth Streets NW, as may be designated by the above-named commission.

But all they would have to do under the language would be to advise the commission to locate the Department of Justice building on a portion of these two squares.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Illinois is correct, as usual, in his observation and comment; but I drew that in that way for this reason: I was much surprised to learn that it had been proposed to locate this Department of Justice building toward Pennsylvania Avenue, quite a number of feet beyond the line of the District of Columbia Building.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent for three minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I know that expert architects and city planners think that so to locate the building would be a mistake and detract much from appearances there.

Mr. MANN. That may be; but, of course, under the orders of the President, as I understand, all of these things had to be passed upon by the Fine Arts Commission, anyhow. I supposed the gentleman was seeking to put in a positive requirement that would govern on the theory that the commission might not follow the existing Executive order, and I wondered whether this would do it or not.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Illinois, when I remind him, will remember that the Executive order made by President Wilson shortly after he came into the office modified and took away the mandatory provision of the Executive order of President Taft, and reads in effect that when the building to be constructed will materially affect the architectural appearance of the city then they shall consult the commission, thus leaving it entirely optional with them.

Mr. MANN. It leaves it optional to accept the plan?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. No; to take the advice.

Mr. MANN. Maybe the gentleman is right.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman will recollect a similar question came up about the location of those buildings down on the water front. The Fine Arts Commission was not consulted about them.

Mr. MANN. Congress located those buildings.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Nor was the opinion of the Fine Arts Commission requested in regard to the new Interior building. But nevertheless the commission vigorously insisted that it ought not to be of red brick. At last their advice as to material for the exterior was heeded. But as first planned



that mammoth structure was to be of red brick, and to loom up like a great red factory.

Mr. MANN. It may be that the amendment will cover. I have no suggestion to offer as to how it ought to be, because I have not canvassed it as the gentleman has. I was thinking they are supposed to consult the Fine Arts Commission anyhow. If they do not do it, and you want to make them do it, you ought to fix it so that they will have to do it. It may be that the language will do that.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that I hold in my hand another amendment to put in after the word "commission" in line 18—"upon the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts."

Mr. MANN. I think that will cover it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent for two minutes more. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield to me? This paragraph provides that the Department of Justice Building shall be located on such portions of squares 226 and 227 immediately south of Pennsylvania Avenue, and so forth. Now, the gentleman states that it is the intention to place that building substantially on a line with the District Municipal Building. As I remember, that would place the north front of the building south of E Street, leaving out of account the entire triangle bounded by E Street, the Avenue, and Fifteenth Street.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The plan of the city of Washington contemplates that that shall be a little park, and that at the head of the Avenue and on the opposite side of the park as you come around from the Treasury Department, shall be the dignified and beautiful front of the building of the Department of Justice.

Mr. TILSON. There will be nothing on that triangle at all?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is the design of the original plan, and that is the one that was approved later.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: On page 38, line 17, after the word "forth," insert the words "upon the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts," and, on the same page, line 18, after the word "commission," insert the words "upon the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have no objection to that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of directing an inquiry to the gentleman in charge of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. STAFFORD. In a prior public-building act we authorized the construction of a building for the Department of State. The plans, I believe, were drawn and the site chosen on which to erect the building. Can the gentleman inform the committee what is the status of that proposition, and the reason why we are not going ahead with that work?

Here we are authorizing the construction of a new building, and yet for several years this authorization has been carried for the building for the Department of State, and there is nothing developed further than the plans.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I will state that originally that property was purchased for the purpose of erecting thereon three departmental buildings—one for the Department of Justice, one for the Department of State, and one for the Department of Commerce and Labor. Since that time the Department of Commerce and Labor has been divided into two separate departments. The plans were drawn, but I understand they were drawn with reference to the construction of those three departmental buildings.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand the plans, they were drawn separately, and a separate plan was drawn for the erection of a building to be used by the Department of State.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I understand that. But I was going on to state that there was one plan drawn for the Department

of Commerce and Labor, and, of course, their having been divided makes it necessary to have a plan for a separate building for each. The Department of State, as I understand it, is really not so much pressed for room as is the Department of Justice. That is in the worst condition of any of them. It was thought that at this particular time the building for the Department of Justice is the only one we could carry in this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, I will have to take issue with that statement, because of the two departments, the Department of Justice and the Department of State, the Department of State needs housing now more than does the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice has only recently—this very month—moved into a privately erected building, which will accommodate it and its activities for years to come.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Whereas the Department of State is housed now, I believe, in three separate buildings.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; but the gentleman must understand that we are paying an enormous rent for this Department of Justice Building, whereas the Department of State is occupying a building owned by the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is just the opposite.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Some of the branches of the Department of State are on the outside.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is just the opposite. The rental of the Department of Justice is one of the most reasonable that the Government has ever secured for a private office building. The rental is at the rate of 33.3 cents per square foot of available space, not including, it is true, the heat and upkeep. But that is one of the best rentals that has ever been secured by the Government. So far as the Department of State is concerned, it is obliged to go into ill-arranged buildings, paying a much higher rental.

I wish to direct this inquiry to the gentleman: Have we not authorized a building for the Department of State?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. All three were authorized at a cost aggregating \$8,000,000 some years ago.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is this supplementary to that authorization?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No; it is not. This is a separation from the \$8,000,000, or a segregating of \$3,000,000 for the building for the Department of State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. This subject, Mr. Chairman, has been called to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations from time to time, and only this year the committee had under consideration the new quarters arranged for the accommodation of the Department of Justice. They have not only an available space in this new building to accommodate their activities at present for all their agencies of work, but additional space to permit of the enlargement of those activities, whereas the Department of State is distributed in two or three private buildings, and only this year, and last year also, it appealed to the committee for authorization to enter into a contract with private parties for the rental of a building that would house all of its activities. From my knowledge of the activities of those departments, I think the Department of State, by reason of its activities—the Mexican situation and other national affairs and the work arising out of the European war—there is much more pressing need to house in a Government building the Department of State, where they need large quarters for the reception of diplomats, than a mere office building for the Department of Justice, which will meet its needs for years to come.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, in order to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, on the 10th of last June the House passed a Senate bill providing for the appointment of a commission to locate a site for a public archives building. What is the status of that now?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not think there has been any selection, or any report made, at any rate. I want to say to the gentleman that I am very much in favor of it, and I think the entire committee recognizes the absolute necessity for such a building.

Mr. FESS. I am glad to hear the gentleman say so.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. And I think we will bring in later on a separate bill covering that matter, which is very urgent.



Mr. FESS. Was anything of that sort brought to the attention of the committee?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, this discussion gives a very good illustration of the absence of economy, pure and simple, touching the building of public buildings, even of the large type. By that I do not mean to say that I think we ought not to build public buildings here for the housing of the great departments, but I do want to call attention to the fact that the usual argument made, particularly by local people desirous of a great building program, will not stand analysis.

It is proposed to appropriate \$3,000,000 for this building. Figuring the interest on \$3,000,000, you will have an interest cost on your investment that represents nearly three times what it is now costing to rent a modern building for the Department of Justice. We are going to pay about \$36,000 rent to house the Department of Justice in the new quarters that they have just moved into, whereas we are proposing to expend \$3,000,000 for a building for that department, the interest on which, I say, would amount to nearly three times that sum. Now, I simply call attention to that as a very pat illustration of the fact that you never get economy out of constructing monumental types of buildings for the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 12. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, additional land for the use of the United States penitentiary on McNeil Island, in the State of Washington, at a limit of cost not to exceed the sum of \$10,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 40, strike out lines 1 to 6, inclusive.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I am unable to determine upon what theory this particular provision was incorporated in a bill to provide for the acquisition of sites for public buildings and for the erection of public buildings on sites already acquired.

This provision is to acquire additional land for the Federal penitentiary at McNeil Island, Wash. The recommendation has twice been made to the Committee on Appropriations for this authority, and has twice been refused because of the absolute worthlessness of the request.

At McNeil Island, Wash., there is a Federal penitentiary. It consists of 87 acres of land. The total value of the land and buildings, according to an appraisal filed with the Committee on Appropriations within two years, is \$143,000. The average convict population of the penitentiary is 200, and the total number of persons upon McNeil Island, an island about 4 miles long and 2½ miles wide, containing 4,300 acres, including prisoners and the officials of the penitentiary, is, according to the reports of the Department of Justice, not to exceed 500 persons. So that for an institution which now has 87 acres of land for 200 inmates it is proposed to spend \$10,000 to acquire no one knows how much land, and no one knows what particular land. This statement is based upon the statements of the officials of the Department of Justice made before the Committee on Appropriations.

On the 23d day of January, 1915, Mr. McGlasson, who is the assistant in charge of the Federal prison, was asked—

The CHAIRMAN. How many acres of ground do you contemplate purchasing?

Mr. MCGLOSSON. We have not decided on any precise number of acres. The warden says that the cost will be from \$150 to \$250 an acre.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you a map showing what is contemplated?

Mr. MCGLOSSON. We have not picked out any particular land. We hope to buy some land adjoining the present reservation.

They do not know how much land they need. They do not know what land they desire. They do not know in what particular place the land is located, but they wish some additional land.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. When I have completed my statement I shall yield. It was suggested that it was desired to get some additional land for the purpose of improving the water supply. Of course, if anyone desired land for the purpose of improving the water supply of an institution, there would be definite information as to what particular land was desired, the area of land that would be required for that purpose, and its character. But the report of the Attorney General for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, just six months ago, discloses that that excuse is not now available. On page 432 of the report, in the part about McNeil Island, is a statement about the farm. There is a well, No. 1, and at that well a pump was installed early in

the year, and during the dry summer months it has been in operation an average of eight hours a day, lifting 3,000 gallons of water per hour. The report states:

The water supply in this well is practically inexhaustible, a test of 48 hours' continuous pumping lowering the water less than an inch.

Drilling at deep well No. 2 has progressed under difficulties. Five hundred feet is the limit that the drilling machine in use at this well is guaranteed to work. The drill in this well, however, has been forced down to a depth of 700 feet, and the water now stands in the pipe about 18 inches above the ground level.

It is probably not advisable to attempt to go deeper in this well with the equipment available, although there is a strong probability that flowing water would be secured if a sufficient depth were attainable. Under the circumstances the installation of an air-lift pump is contemplated, after which the water supply of the institution will be more than doubled and should be amply sufficient for all purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask that my time be extended five minutes.

Mr. DYER. I ask that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the time of the gentleman from New York be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. So that when this pump is installed there will be ample water supply and the excuse that the land is needed for the purpose of increasing the water supply is obviated.

It was stated before the Committee on Appropriations by the superintendent of Federal prisons that it would be advisable to abandon this prison and to send all of the Federal prisoners to Atlanta and to Leavenworth, where we have modern, well-equipped prisons. When the State of Washington was admitted to the Union it was provided that this Federal prison, which was established in 1867, should be turned over to the State of Washington. The Federal Government offered the prison and its equipment to the State, and the governor declined to accept it until the legislature would make provision for its maintenance, and the legislature has consistently refused ever since to take the prison over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Including the prisoners.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It would be used as a State institution. Here is an island of about 4,300 acres of land, upon which there are 200 convicts. A little over 100 or 200 persons outside of the prison inmates and officials live on the island. What peculiar value land will have in such a location it is difficult to imagine. Who would wish to establish a summer home, or engage in some commercial enterprise, upon an island where there is an unfenced Federal prison? Yet some one has some land that he is preparing to unload on the Federal Government at a cost of from \$150 to \$250 an acre.

I spent three years in a boarding school in which there were 300 pupils on 100 acres of land. I know that 87 acres of land is more than ample for every possible use that is proper for an institution of 200 persons. This item, Mr. Chairman, can not be justified on the ground that it is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, that it has anything to do with public buildings, that it is for any public use or for any public purpose. It ought to be excluded from this bill. While I differ as to the propriety of some items in this bill, I have refrained from discussing them.

I can appreciate that there can be an honest difference of opinion about many items in the bill. But here is an item that has no legitimate excuse for continuing in the bill. It does not accomplish anything. It would be in order before this session adjourns to offer as an amendment to the sundry civil bill a proposition to acquire adjacent land to the McNeil penitentiary, because an amendment to acquire land adjacent to an existing institution is in order on the sundry civil bill. If this proposition has merit it could be justified, and instead of having merely an authorization which this bill gives without any money, the money would be forthcoming at once. The item can not be justified and ought in the interest of common legislative decency to be excluded from the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion to strike this item from the bill, although I desire to say frankly that I do not favor the passage of a public-buildings bill at this time. I hope that the paragraph calling for \$10,000 with which to add territory to the site of a Federal penitentiary located on McNeil Island in the State of Washington will not be sufficient to accuse myself and my colleagues with attempted pork-grabbing.

Here is an item that has been everybody's business and nobody's business for years. Nothing can be gained by singling out this as the one item to strike from this bill. A Federal grand jury, as a result of full investigation, issued a report some years ago, asking that steps be taken for the purchase of this



land. I introduced a bill to purchase probably 100 acres—additional land—for not to exceed \$10,000, and because the bill was referred by the Speaker to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the item has come forth in this bill.

The necessity for the additional land is, first, to secure a water supply for the Federal penitentiary that was located there, as the gentleman from New York said, before the State became a State, and, second, for the purpose of providing additional land to be farmed by the prisoners, the present site being 87 acres, not all tillable. Lands in one end of the island will be purchased of these homesteaders who settled there before the days of the penitentiary, so as to make this end of the island a penitentiary site somewhat similar to that of Blackwells Island.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But there are 15,000 acres in the island and the Government only has 87.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. There are more than 200 prisoners there.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Attorney General says that last year there were 226.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Two hundred and thirty-six. The number at the time of the last report was 239, and they received 2 more, making 241, and 5 are discharged, leaving a population of 236. These prisoners come from Alaska, California, Montana, Idaho, and the State of Washington. Indian offenders are frequently sent there.

It would not be in the line of either Federal efficiency or Federal economy to transport prisoners from Alaska to Atlanta, Ga. This penitentiary is considered a modern penitentiary. The prisoners indulge in agriculture; they use this land; they need more. At times there have been outbreaks and 15 or 20 prisoners have escaped, and, overrunning the island, have terrorized the inhabitants.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Does the gentleman think that the addition of 100 acres to what they now have would change the situation as to prisoners overrunning the island?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Well, let them overrun it if there is no one else there.

Mr. SHERLEY. What the gentleman is planning for is to buy everybody's land on that island and unload the ownership upon the Federal Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am offering this at the suggestion of the Federal grand jury.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course, the Federal grand jury out there is glad to have Uncle Sam spend his money there; but what reason is there for expending good money on that island except for the men who live on the island, who own the land and want to get rid of it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We want to get them off of one end of the island and pay them a nominal sum for their holdings.

Mr. SHERLEY. But there is no obligation on the part of the Government to pay them and get them off of the island, where they voluntarily went.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But they went there before the penitentiary was established.

Mr. SHERLEY. Why not be frank and say that this is a bill to recompense homesteaders who went upon this island, where a penitentiary has since been established?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have made a statement with regard to that. A complete report and statement from the grand jury was filed by me in the office of the chairman of this committee and with the Department of Justice. The department has, I believe, made numerous attempts to secure an appropriation for the purchase of additional land.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The gentleman from New York seems to be somewhat out of humor because the people of the State of Washington do not want to take over this penitentiary. We do not want it. It is not maintained for the people of Washington; it is for Federal prisoners.

I will tell the gentleman what the purpose of this appropriation of \$10,000 is. I did not introduce the bill, it is not in my district, and I do not care personally anything about it. I wish they would remove this prison, take it out of the State. The Government ought to keep that prison so that it is in proper shape to keep prisoners or they ought to abolish it. Here is the condition at this time. I will read a letter from the Department of Justice which throws some light on the proposition. It is not for the purpose of purchasing the homesteads from the people who live there. This letter says:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
Washington, D. C., January 17, 1916.

Hon. FRANK CLARK,

Chairman Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: The department acknowledges the receipt of your letter of the 13th instant requesting a report on bill H. R. 4776, making an appropriation of \$10,000 for the purchase of additional land for the United States penitentiary, McNeil Island, Wash.

Under the act of Congress approved January 22, 1867, provision was made for the erection of a United States penitentiary in Washington Territory, the amount to be expended for this purpose being limited to \$20,000. The act approved February 22, 1873, authorized an increased sum of \$20,000, and in 1874 an additional appropriation of about \$7,000 was made to place the buildings in a suitable condition for the reception and confinement of convicts.

After the approval of the act of February 22, 1889 (25 Stat., 680), providing for the admission of Washington Territory into the Union as a State, the attention of Federal officials therein was called in 1890 to section 15 of said act, which the department seemed to hold provided for the transfer of the United States penitentiary on McNeil Island to the State of Washington. Instructions to this effect were given the then United States marshal, district of Washington, but the governor of the State declined to accept the institution, with the prisoners therein, until specific authority for its acceptance had been conferred on him by the Legislature of Washington. This was never done, and the United States marshal was accordingly directed by the Attorney General to continue to conduct the penitentiary as before, and it has since been, and is now, conducted as a Federal institution.

In the estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1916 the department had an item of \$10,000 for the purchase of additional land for the McNeil Island institution, but the appropriation was not made by Congress and the item therefore was not again included in the estimates for 1917.

The penitentiary reservation now contains 87 acres, which is divided as follows:

Penitentiary reservation.	Acres.
Prison-yard inclosure	12½
Beach, roads, and slough	22
Meadow and pasturage	32½
Garden truck	7
Potatoes	6
Orchard	5
Strawberries	1
Blackberries	½
Raspberries	½
Total	87

Land in the vicinity of the reservation is held at \$150 to \$250 per acre.

This penitentiary is located on an island in Puget Sound, some 3 miles in the nearest direction from the mainland. The island contains something like 50 or 60 square miles. There are a few farmers and fishermen on the island. The penitentiary water supply is obtained by piping water from springs to cement storage tanks. The supply is inadequate, and in case of fire the tanks would soon be exhausted—in fact, on bathing days the tanks are almost empty. Experimental wells have been sunk in an endeavor to get more water. The warden says he is opposed to the erection of any more prison buildings or the doing of any more work to improve or enlarge the penitentiary until the water question has been exhausted.

The estimate of \$10,000 made in the estimates for 1916 was for the purchase of additional land having springs or other water supply and upon which to raise supplies for the prison and to give increased fodder production and pasturage for milk cows.

The institution now has accommodations for a maximum of 225 prisoners, and the population is about up to the maximum. It has been necessary to divert Federal prisoners from districts along the Pacific coast to State prisons to prevent overcrowding the McNeil Island institution. The number of prisoners received each year from Alaska and Pacific Coast States is increasing and another cell wing should be erected at the McNeil Island institution to take care of this increase and to avoid sending prisoners to State prisons, where they must be boarded by the Government. However, it would not be advisable to build this new wing until additional land is obtained for water supply, pasturage, and other purposes.

Respectfully,  
For the Attorney General:

SAM. J. GRAHAM,  
Assistant Attorney General.

Now, think of keeping 230 prisoners there in a prison where they have not sufficient water supply, and which on bathing days is exhausted.

Mr. SHERLEY rose.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; I do not yield at this time—and when in case of fire they would have no protection. It seems to be the idea of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], who is a great economist—and I admire him for it, and I very often follow what he says—that it would be economy to keep that penitentiary in such shape that it is not habitable for these prisoners that come from Alaska, Washington, and Montana, and to pay transportation to take them to these other penitentiaries throughout the country. This letter says that the number of prisoners received from Alaska and the Pacific coast is still increasing and that another wing should be erected to provide for the increase.

I think you can begin to see some of the reasons why it is necessary to have this \$10,000. In the first place, it is to maintain at that prison sufficient water supply for convenience and safety, and in the next place, to save the expense of sending the prisoners to other prisons in the interior, which would cost a great deal more than it would to take them to this prison.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?



Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I got a little confused about this situation. I understood the other gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] to say something that indicated a purpose on the part of the proponents of this measure or some one else to have the Government acquire title to all of the land upon that island.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I never heard anything about that.

Mr. SLAYDEN. About 15,000 acres, worth from one hundred to two hundred dollars per acre.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I think I was misunderstood, or, perhaps, I made a statement which was not quite clear. The report of the grand jury says that it is desired to buy about 100 additional acres.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Ten thousand dollars would not buy that island. A considerable portion of it, I think, is very fine land; but evidently the purpose of this \$10,000 is to purchase some of the springs on the hillside so that they can have this water by gravity system instead of by well. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations ought to refuse any further appropriation for this prison and abandon it, or we ought to make this small appropriation and secure these springs and have the water supply where these prisoners can be properly kept.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman state where there are any springs? I tried to find out where there was any supply. Nobody in the Department of Justice knew anything about it, and apparently nobody on this floor from the State of Washington has any further information.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Oh, the gentleman has assumed in advance that we do not know anything more about it than he does.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the Department of Justice had shown a necessity to acquire land to increase the water supply there would have been no trouble in getting it, but the Department of Justice knew nothing about it. They simply wanted the \$10,000 to purchase somebody's land, and did not know where it was located, what was in it, or what was on it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I would presume, if this \$10,000 were given to the Department of Justice, that they would not be so idiotic as to go out and purchase land that had no water on it. There is no doubt that there are springs in that vicinity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FITZGERALD) there were—ayes 27, noes 60.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 13. That the following-described public buildings and grounds at Sitka, Alaska, are granted to the Territory of Alaska, to be used by the said Territory as a home for aged, sick, and infirm pioneers and residents thereof, at the expense of the Territory, to wit:

The barracks tract, beginning at a point on the north side of Lincoln Street 212.5 feet from an old cannon set in the ground at the intersection of said Lincoln Street with the beach line; thence north 54° 30' east 122 feet, thence north 37° 30' west 220 feet, thence north 48° east 40 feet, thence north 33° 30' east 17 feet, thence north 30° 30' west 86 feet, thence south 56° 30' west 163 feet, thence south 36° east 56.2 feet, thence south 52° 30' west 78.4 feet, and from thence south 49° 30' east 277.8 feet to the place of beginning, with the buildings thereon.

The naval hospital tract, beginning at a point 40 feet from the north-west corner of the barracks tract and in the line which forms the northern boundary of the parade ground, from thence north 47° west 160 feet, thence south 79° west 17.8 feet, thence south 11° west 98.5 feet, thence south 50° 30' east 108 feet, and from thence north 52° 30' east 82 feet to the place of beginning, with the buildings thereon.

The parade-ground tract, beginning at a point marked by an old cannon embedded vertically in the ground at the intersection of Lincoln Street with the beach line, thence north 54° 30' east 212.5 feet, thence north 49° 30' west 277.8 feet, thence south 52° 30' west 120.5 feet, thence south 50° 30' east 28 feet, thence south 52° 30' west 51 feet to the beach line, and from thence 228 feet along the beach line to the place of beginning, with the buildings thereon.

The tide flat between high and low water in front of the parade-ground tract, on which is situated a boat landing belonging to the above-described premises, with the buildings thereon.

All line courses in the foregoing descriptions are given in geographical directions.

That the Territory of Alaska shall never sell or otherwise dispose of any part of said property, and if the same shall ever be abandoned for the uses herein declared the said premises shall revert to the United States.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Hon. S. R. Blanton, of Owensboro, Ky., is at the Capital for the purpose of delivering to the President and Members of Congress certain resolutions adopted by the American Society of Equity. Mr. Blanton is general organizer for the society and holds credentials from Mr. H. G. Tank, of Wausau, Wis., the national secretary and treasurer of the organization.

The American Society of Equity is a powerful farmers' organization. It was organized 14 years ago. It has a membership

of over half a million distributed over 15 States. It has done much for the farmers. In the Northwest its most important work has been in organizing local grain elevators and a large terminal elevator at St. Paul. At almost every station in my State there is a local grain elevator cooperatively owned by equity members. Finding it necessary to follow their grain to the terminals the American Society of Equity, through a subsidiary corporation, the Equity Cooperative Exchange, built a great terminal elevator at St. Paul, which is now in successful operation. To do this required a great amount of agitation and the cooperation of a large number of farmers scattered over the farms in Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana, who showed their faith in the enterprise by investing their money in it. While others have talked and dreamed about cooperative marketing, the equity men have been organizing successfully to market their products. The marketing of grain is only one of their activities, and is mentioned only to show the helpful and large way the society tackles farm problems. Among the men directing the affairs of the society and responsible for its great growth and success are D. O. Mahoney, president, Viroqua, Wis.; H. G. Tank, secretary and treasurer, Wausau, Wis.; M. F. Sharp, national organizer, St. Paul, Minn.; John M. Anderson, president Equity Cooperative Exchange, St. Paul; J. G. Crites, general manager; G. A. Thiel, treasurer; F. E. Osborn, convention manager; A. M. Baker, editor Cooperators Herald; M. P. Johnson, president of the North Dakota division; and Magnus Johnson, holding a similar position in Minnesota.

The annual convention of the society was held last month. Important resolutions were adopted. Ordinarily such resolutions are trusted to the mails, and sometimes the passing of resolutions is a perfunctory thing of little meaning. Not so with the American Society of Equity. They directed that one of their number should personally carry their resolutions to Washington. In pursuance of this the national secretary, Mr. H. G. Tank, wrote a letter of introduction for Mr. S. R. Blanton, who is here now to perform the task assigned to him by his society. It will lighten his burden to have the resolutions printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; it will be a convenience to those of you who have not already read the resolutions to find them in to-morrow morning's RECORD. Mr. Blanton advises me that they were passed without a dissenting vote. I ask permission to have the resolutions printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The resolutions are as follows:

Resolutions adopted by the fourteenth annual convention, American Society of Equity, December 12-15, 1916.

Whereas since the passage of the Smith-Lever Act we have a system in the State and Nation whereby experts are furnished to counties desiring them to assist farmers in their agricultural problems. We heartily indorse this movement, provided the system is not abused and made the instrument of those who are dubious of or unfriendly to our plans for better business organization, cooperative marketing, and rural credit reform. We are opposed to the county agent plan when boards of trade, advancement associations, or other groups of men whose interests are not in accord with ours seek to control the county representative and prevent him from assisting farmers who need help in organization of those cooperative marketing associations familiar to us all.

Therefore we recommend that our national secretary be instructed to cooperate with our State union secretary, to the end that full information relative to the work which the county agents are doing in the several States be secured, and submit the result of this investigation to our membership through the medium of our National and State papers.

We earnestly urge upon Congress the imperative need of a prompt and thorough investigation by the Federal Trade Commission, assisted by the Department of Agriculture, of the marketing of live stock and the meat-packing industries in this and other countries. We urge that this investigation be followed by a report, with constructive recommendations for the improvement of the conditions and methods under which live stock is marketed and the products thereof manufactured, distributed, and sold.

We urge upon Congress the making of an adequate appropriation and the giving of adequate authority to the Federal Trade Commission to enable it to cover all important phases of the problem, including the experiences of other countries with municipal abattoirs and cooperatively owned packing plants, all to the end that a free and uncontrolled market may be assured, that any existing abuses may be corrected, that present wastes may be eliminated, and that new methods may be adopted. We further urge that the fullest publicity be given to all facts affecting the prices of live stock received by the producer and the cost of meat products paid by the consumer.

Whereas certain groups of big business have seized upon the opportunity offered by the European war to foist upon the people of this Republic a military force that will, if not checked, surpass the militarism of any country on the habitable globe; and

Whereas militarism is directly contrary to the spirit of our institutions and hostile to a republican form of government and perilous to the liberties of the common people; and

Whereas in order to establish this un-American, undemocratic, and unnecessary military burden upon the people, as a first essential in that direction, Congress passed what is known as the Hay-Chamberlain Army reorganization bill, which makes a soldier of every able-bodied male citizen of the United States and gives power to the President to draft them into military service; and



Whereas the agricultural and industrial workers make up the greatest part of the military serviceable citizenship, so that when they are drafted into the military service our productive agricultural and industrial activities will be interrupted and society's welfare thereby injured; and

Whereas it is the common people who, in case of war, are the trench diggers and food for the cannons' mouths, driven to the slaughter, while those who profit by war get not near the firing line; and

Whereas the expenditures for military purposes in this country have become unreasonable, unbearable, the expenditures for 1916 being \$873,000,000 and the estimates for 1917 being \$800,694,684, the grand total for the two years reaching the colossal sum of \$1,173,694,684, a sum twice as large as was ever appropriated by any Government in any country within the same time in times of peace: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the American Society of Equity in national convention assembled on this 12th day of December, 1916,* That we demand of the Congress of the United States the immediate repeal of the un-American measure known as the Hay-Chamberlain Army reorganization bill; and

*Resolved further,* That a committee of one be appointed by this body to wait on the President of the United States and upon the Members of Congress with copies of this resolution; also that the national secretary be requested to have printed 600 copies of this resolution for this purpose.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Florida a question. I do not know whether the gentleman has stated it or not, but I should like to know how much the totals of this bill are increased by the various committee amendments that have been adopted.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have not the figures, but it is very slight.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Several hundred thousand dollars?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, no. The gentleman means by amendments that have been offered and adopted since the bill has been under consideration in the House?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes; amendments by the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, I should not think over \$200,000.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I caught four or five of them which amounted to something like twenty or twenty-five thousand dollars, and I thought the total might have run up to a considerable amount.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No; I think not; but I can have the figures for the gentleman in a short time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 15. That it shall be the duty of the custodians of all public buildings of the United States of America and all buildings in which is located a post office of the United States to raise over such building the flag of the United States of America on each secular day when weather conditions are favorable. It shall be the duty of any department of the Government under which division said buildings or post offices are controlled to provide for any such building a suitable flag for the purposes herein provided.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record upon this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I suppose the gentleman desires to insert a speech about standing by the flag and the appropriations?

Mr. LANGLEY. It was at my suggestion, as a member of the committee, that this section was incorporated in the bill, and I want to explain my purpose in doing that, but I do not want to take the time to do it now.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that it is my purpose to ask before we get through that all gentlemen have the right to extend their remarks in the Record upon this bill, whether they have spoken or not.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 16. That so much of section 4 of the public-building act approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stats., p. 873), as authorizes the acquisition of a site and the erection of a suitable building thereon for the United States customhouse at Nogales, Ariz., at a cost not exceeding \$110,000, and so much of section 5 of said act (37 Stats., p. 877) as authorizes the acquisition of a site for the United States post office and other governmental offices at Nogales, Ariz., at a cost not exceeding \$10,000, be, and the same are hereby, amended so as to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, one site and to erect thereon one building for the of such sale into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt, accommodation of the United States post office, customhouse, and other governmental offices in Nogales, Ariz., at a cost not exceeding \$120,000, of which limit of cost not exceeding \$15,000 shall be expended for such site; and that the appropriation of \$16,000 made by the act of Congress approved July 29, 1914 (38 Stats., p. 563), in pursuance of said authorization of March 4, 1913, for a site and building for said customhouse, be, and the same is hereby, made available for the acquisition of the site and the commencement of the erection of the building hereinbefore authorized for said post office and customhouse.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a committee amendment there, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 43, amend by striking out all of line 26.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to,

The Clerk read as follows:

United States courthouse and other branches of the Government service at Dallas, Tex., upon the site acquired for that purpose, \$1,250,000. And the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to sell at public sale, after due advertisement once a week for four successive weeks in some newspaper published in Dallas, Tex., the present Federal building at Dallas and the site upon which the same is located for not less than \$1,000,000, the proceeds of the said sale to be paid into the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt: *Provided*, That the Government is to occupy and use the same until the new Federal building herein provided for shall have been completed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. This portion of the bill which contains substantive propositions under sections—are we considering the bill by sections or paragraphs?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. We are considering this portion of the bill by sections when it is all one item.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment. This amendment is similar to the amendment that has heretofore been agreed upon as to the terms of sale for these various public-building sites and buildings.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 23, strike out lines 23 and 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "by private sale, but at not less than the value as determined by an appraisal thereof by the Secretary of the Treasury and upon such terms as he may deem for the best interests of the United States, the."

And strike out, on page 45, line 1, the words "for not less than \$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and convey such land and building by the usual quitclaim deed to the purchaser thereof."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That will leave—

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the form heretofore adopted by the committee.

Mr. ASHBROOK. If I followed the amendment, it struck out all of lines 23 and 24. I believe it should not strike out the word "the," in line 24, the last word in line 24.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think I have the word "the" included in the amendment. It may be that the Clerk did not report it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Very well.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was very careful in drafting the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that later we may return to this item for the purpose of making a brief statement in regard to it, providing we get along with the bill sufficiently fast for me to make that statement before adjournment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 18. United States post office, courthouse, and other Government offices at Rock Hill, S. C., \$125,000. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell the present building and site, at public or private sale, and turn the proceeds of said sale into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt. If the Secretary of the Treasury finds that it is more feasible to buy additional land for a site for the Federal courthouse adjacent to or near the present post-office building, he is hereby authorized to acquire such additional land, by purchase or condemnation, and to erect a courthouse on the same, and in that event the sum of \$100,000 is hereby authorized for the acquisition of said additional land and the erection of a courthouse on the same.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment. This amendment is similar in purport to the one just adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 45, line 10, insert, after the word "sale," the following: "but at not less than the value as determined by an appraisal thereof by the Secretary of the Treasury and upon such terms as he may deem for the best interests of the United States, and convey said land and building by the usual quitclaim deed to the purchaser thereof."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, that is satisfactory.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 19. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a suitable site upon which to erect a building for the post office, courts, and other branches of the Government service at Newark, N. J., at a limit of cost not exceeding \$600,000, or, in his discretion, to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, additional land adjoining the site upon which the Federal building at Newark, N. J., now stands, and remodel, rearrange, and enlarge the present building at a limit of cost not to exceed the said sum of \$600,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on pages 45 and 46, by striking out all of section 18 and inserting in lieu thereof the following as section 19:

"Sec. 19. That for the purpose of providing adequate accommodations for the post office, courts, and other branches of the Government service at Newark, N. J., the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, additional land adjoining the site upon which the Federal



building at Newark, N. J., stands, and remodel, rearrange, and enlarge the present building and remodel, rearrange, and enlarge any or all buildings on said additional land that may be acquired, at a limit of cost not to exceed the cost of \$600,000."

Mr. MANN. As the Clerk reported the amendment it was to strike out section 18.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That is a mistake. It is section 19. He made a mistake in reading the section.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 21. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to sell, at public or private sale, for such sum as in his judgment he may deem proper, the lot now owned by the Government of the United States in the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., which said lot is bounded by Penn Avenue, Liberty Avenue, Fifteenth Street, and Sixteenth Street, and pay the proceeds of such sale into the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt.

For the enlargement, remodeling, and repairing the present Federal building at Pittsburgh, Pa., including all changes in, extension of, or additions and repairs to the mechanical equipment which may be made necessary by reason of such enlargement, remodeling, or repairing of said building, not to exceed \$50,000.

The Clerk reported the committee amendment, as follows:

Insert, after the word "proceeds," in line 28, the following: "of such sale into the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. If we are considering this bill by sections and not by paragraphs, before a committee amendment can be reported the entire section should be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk had not finished reading the section.

The Clerk completed the reading of the section.

The committee amendment was reported, as follows:

Add, on page 46, at the end of line 25, by inserting the following: "of such sale into the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 22, after the word "proper," insert "but not less than \$750,000."

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer that amendment for the reason that that property was purchased about 11 years ago, and this lot described in the section has been held by the Government ever since. The property has really decreased in value evidently all along. No Secretary of the Treasury from that time to this has seen fit to recommend that a building be put on that property, and the property was estimated just about a year ago by several business men and real estate firms who wrote on the subject and estimated it to be worth less than half the value of \$750,000.

I believe Congress, however, about four years ago passed a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell that property at \$750,000. It seems he has been unable to get a sale for that up to this time, but in the past few months large interests have started a movement in that direction, and I received a letter day before yesterday from certain parties in the city, a real estate firm, stating that they felt they could secure, if they had a short option, \$750,000, or the price that was named by the bill that passed this Congress. Now, that has been substantiated by other rumors, and I feel that the United States Government can receive for this property at least \$750,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If the gentleman will permit, I will state that the committee authorized the sale of this property, I think in 1913, at an upset price of \$750,000, and have never been able to get an offer anywhere in that neighborhood. The committee thought at this time they would simply leave it to the discretion of the Treasury Department. I think the gentleman will agree that all the citizens of Pittsburgh, or practically all of them, agree that this is not the proper location for the Federal building.

Mr. GARLAND. I am not urging that as a location.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I think the gentleman will agree this is not a proper location.

Mr. GARLAND. I do; yes. I have another amendment that I wish to offer.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARLAND. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. I intend to offer an amendment to this paragraph, in order to have it harmonious.

Mr. GARLAND. I would prefer the gentleman wait until my other amendment is acted on.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is one amendment pending that is rather inconsistent with the policy that has heretofore been adopted. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. GARLAND. I desire, if the gentleman prefers to offer an amendment, to have this amendment go up to the desk first and be read. It is to the same paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. You have not offered it?

Mr. GARLAND. I have it here. I was discussing the other.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wanted to direct an inquiry to either one or both.

Mr. GARLAND. They are separate. There should be a different vote on them. In the light of the statement I have just made there is strong evidence that \$750,000 can be secured for that property, and we ought to put in the bill a provision to sell it for no less sum in light of the fact that the same large interests are now attempting to sell to the Government another lot.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he would not withhold his amendment for an amendment to perfect the section. The gentleman from Wisconsin has such an amendment.

Mr. MANN. It is in conflict with this amendment. Why should we not set an upset price?

Mr. GARLAND. I do not know what the gentleman's amendment is.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Wisconsin wants the Secretary of the Treasury to set his own price on it. There has been so much crooked work about the purchase of this site in Pittsburgh before that we ought to be careful.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; we have fixed the upset price.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania says he thinks it is possible to obtain that price.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am not objecting to the upset price, but it seems to me the proposition of the gentleman should go.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman's amendment will result in selling this property at half a million dollars instead of three-quarters of a million dollars, if it depends on the Treasury experts; and the opinion of the Treasury experts in the purchase of this property has not been worth anything.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course, the amendment I intend to offer is not in any way conflicting with the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GARLAND]. It provides that property shall not be sold for less than the value set by the appraisal, and then there would also be the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that it should not be less than \$750,000. The appraisal might be \$900,000 or \$1,000,000.

Mr. GARLAND. I am willing to include that.

Mr. MANN. I think in the Dallas, Tex., provision they struck out \$1,000,000, because it was in conflict with the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. I did it, because I thought, and I still think, that we are not in a position here in Congress to determine the value of property. It must be an administrative function. Of course, in this case there has been, too, but maybe there has been some questionable procedure in connection with it, and therefore in view of that statement I would not offer my amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman, but offer it as a separate amendment later on.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GARLAND].

Mr. CLARK of Florida. What is his amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 22, after the word "proper," insert "at not less than \$750,000."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. We have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GARLAND. There is another amendment there.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARLAND: Page 46, line 26, after the word "States," strike out all of the line, and all of line 27, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "to be held in a fund to apply on the purchase of a suitable lot or piece of ground in said city."

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in offering that amendment is that the money, whatever it may be, is secured by the sale of the lot, which is contemplated now, and will be held in the Treasury Department for the purpose of purchasing other ground there. Pittsburgh about 40 years ago was permitted to build a post office by an appropriation. From that time up to this they have never had another building of any kind, and they have grown to that extent that the statements that have been made concerning Chicago, Philadelphia, and other places fit Pittsburgh exactly. Eleven years ago this appropria-



tion was made for the purpose of purchasing a piece of ground. Nine hundred and forty thousand dollars, I believe, they paid for it.

Now, the Government has held that land ever since and refused to put a building on it, and as a consequence we have been renting every old shack around the town that we could get for post-office and Federal office purposes. We are paying now over \$75,000 a year rentals for outside buildings, and because of this particular ground being undesirable we have been unable to get an appropriation to put a building anywhere else. The ground was there, and the Government authorities felt that we were not entitled to purchase anything else while it was on their hands.

Now, if they sell it, the funds that are there should immediately, so far as they will go, be applied toward the purchasing of a suitable piece of ground, so that we can then get an appropriation through the next Congress to build a building and relieve the situation there.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we shall certainly have to oppose that amendment. The idea of allowing the money to be held in a separate fund whenever this lot is sold is unusual. We are carrying \$50,000 in the bill to provide for the temporary needs of Pittsburgh, waiting until this property can be sold and another site can be purchased. The money will be available. The gentleman need not be afraid of that. But this would be unusual. We are opposed to putting aside trust funds of this character.

Mr. GARLAND. I do not know whether it is known to the gentleman or not, but this \$50,000 that he speaks of will not bring back into the post-office building any of the different departments that have been put outside. It will only relieve us of the congestion that now is so overpowering that something must be done temporarily. It will not give us any permanent relief.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. But, Mr. Chairman, there is no earthly necessity for taking this action. This lot was bought some years ago for something over \$900,000. It was absolutely unsuitable, and we have not been able to sell the land for even half a million dollars since. I doubt if we could get it to-day. We are certainly opposed to selling the property and converting it into a trust fund to be expended hereafter.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GARLAND].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, I will ask permission to submit to this particular section another amendment after a while.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 46, line 21, after the word "sale," strike out the remainder of the line and the words "deem proper," in line 22, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "at not less than the value as determined by the appraisal thereof by the Secretary of the Treasury and upon such terms as he may deem for the best interests of the United States."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this would leave in the qualifying clause of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GARLAND], which would immediately follow "not less than \$750,000," so that it is not inconsistent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment, to follow the amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GARLAND] and which was adopted—the first one.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD, to follow the amendment of Mr. GARLAND: "and conveyed by the usual quitclaim deed."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 22. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be constructed upon a suitable site to be selected by him, together with the Secretary of War, upon land already owned by the Government of the United States at the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, an armory building for the National Guard of the District of Columbia, in accordance with the plans for such armory submitted by the commission appointed by the act of Congress approved May 30, 1908, or such modified plans as may be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of War, at a limit of cost not to exceed the sum of \$800,000: *Provided*, That one half of this amount shall be paid out of the Treasury of the United

States and the remaining half shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Amend, on page 47, by striking out all of section 22 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 22. That the commission created by section 17 of the act approved May 30, 1908, be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be erected, under the supervision of the Secretary of War, upon a suitable site to be selected by them upon the advice of the National Commission of Fine Arts, upon land already owned by the Government of the United States in the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, an armory building for the National Guard of the District of Columbia in accordance with the plans for such armory submitted by said commission, or such modified plans as may be approved by the Secretary of War, at a limit of cost not to exceed the sum of \$800,000: *Provided*, That one-half of this amount shall be paid out of the Treasury of the United States and the remaining half shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Florida kindly explain what the commission is that was created by the act of May 30, 1908?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will state to the gentleman that there was a commission created and given charge of this building, this armory, under the supervision of the Secretary of War. When we drew this provision we did not know of it, or it had passed out of our minds, and we put it under the Treasury Department. Col. Harts called it to my attention and stated that they had ample means and architects and facilities, and so forth, in the War Department, and that they wanted it especially constructed under the War Department.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then there is an existing commission to take charge of this work referred to in the amendment offered by the gentleman?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. DYER. The commission consists of the Assistant Secretary of War, the general commanding the National Guard of the District of Columbia, the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds in Washington, and the Superintendent of the United States Capitol Building and Grounds. That is the commission created by this act.

Mr. STAFFORD. That would consist, the gentleman says, of one of the Assistant Secretaries of War?

Mr. DYER. The Assistant Secretary of War.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is only one assistant. Gen. Schofield sometimes acts as Acting Secretary. Then there would be the head of the militia, the gentleman says?

Mr. DYER. The general commanding the militia of the District.

Mr. STAFFORD. And Col. Harts and Mr. Elliot Woods?

Mr. DYER. Yes; that is the commission that was created.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of calling the attention of the committee to the importance of this item.

Section 22 of this bill just read provides for a new armory building for the National Guard in the District of Columbia, and is in accord, substantially, with the provisions of the bill (H. R. 3624) that I introduced at the first session of this Congress. I also introduced a similar bill in the preceding Congress. At a hearing held by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds upon this bill (H. R. 3624) on February 2, 1916, it was the unanimous opinion of those qualified to speak upon this subject that there was the greatest possible need for a new armory building in this city. The hearings referred to were upon the bill which I introduced and which reference I heretofore made. The important needs of this building are many. Among them are the necessity for safeguarding and properly caring for more than \$300,000 worth of Government property which is now stored in unsuitable and unsafe rented buildings without protection from fire. The Government is now paying some \$16,000 a year rent for these buildings. The new building is also needed in order that the necessary provisions can be had for the training and instructing of the members of the District of Columbia National Guard. It is impossible to give them these instructions in the present armories. It is also desired that the new armory shall provide moral and mental amusements and benefits for the men, as well as a swimming tank, bowling alleys, shooting galleries, riding hall, gymnasiums, library, and so forth. The city of Washington, the National Capital, has the poorest armories, and so forth, that are to be found practically in the country. There ought to be built here a model armory and one that will be the pride of the whole people and which will demonstrate to the world that the United States Government believes in its National Guard.



It is the intention to also give to the veterans of the Civil War and the Spanish War uses of this building. The intermingling thereof of the men of the National Guard with those who have seen service will cause a greater interest to be taken in military and National Guard affairs in the city of Washington. No place in the country has more splendid or worthy young men, or who have been more ready to offer their services to their country, than those who have been or who are members of the National Guard of the District of Columbia.

Brig. Gen. William E. Harvey, commanding the District of Columbia Militia, appeared before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds on February 2 and, together with other officials of the United States Army and of the National Guard, testified to the great needs and importance of a new armory for the District of Columbia. The then Secretary of War, Lindley M. Garrison, indorsed the bill which I introduced. The late Gen. Albert L. Mills, of the United States Army and of the division of military affairs, also gave the bill the strongest possible indorsement, as did Col. William W. Harts, United States Army and the superintendent of public buildings and grounds. Brig. Gen. Harvey prepared and had printed in the hearings of February 2, 1916, a memorandum in support of the bill (H. R. 3624), and which I call the attention of the Members of the Congress to in order that they may be fully informed as to the necessity of this legislation. I refer specially to a part of the memorandum. He says:

The National Guard of the District of Columbia is a Federal force created by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1889 (25 Stat. L., 774), and the act of February 18, 1909 (35 Stat. L., 629). The President of the United States is its commander in chief, and it is under the immediate supervision of the War Department.

The following is a statement showing the organization and the number of officers and enlisted men, shown by the return for the quarter ending December 31, 1913:

Organizations.	Commissioned officers.	Enlisted men.	Aggregate.
General officers of the line.....	1		1
Adjutant general's department.....	2		2
Inspector general's department.....	1		1
Judge advocate general's department.....	1		1
Quartermaster corps (including quartermaster corps' personnel of trains).....	5	4	9
Medical department (including detachments in sanitary train).....	113	62	75
Corps of engineers (including engineer troops).....			
Ordnance department.....	1	1	2
Infantry, Third Infantry, and First Separate Battalion.....	61	1,471	1,532
Cavalry.....			
Field Artillery.....	5	197	202
Signal troops.....	3	73	76
Coast Artillery corps.....		68	68
Naval battalion staff.....	7		7
First division.....	1	37	38
Second division.....	1	39	40
Third division.....	2	60	62
Fourth division.....	2	52	54
Total.....	106	2,064	2,169

<sup>1</sup> This includes 1 officer in Medical Reserve Corps.

<sup>2</sup> This includes 77 men carried on reserve list.

For a quarter of a century it has struggled along without any proper provision being made for housing it. It has been quartered in rented buildings of various sorts, none of which have afforded the requisite facilities for training the troops and caring for the equipment, which is the property of the United States.

The entire unsatisfactory and even discreditable accommodations for this organization have been commented upon year after year by the inspecting officers of the United States. A personal inspection of the buildings discloses the fact that these reports are not exaggerated, but are well founded in fact.

The organization at the present time is scattered about the city in nine different buildings, none of which are fireproof and none of which afford enough room for the keeping of the equipment. Some of the buildings have no provision at all for drilling the troops, and the troops are compelled to drill in the streets. For these unsatisfactory, uninviting, and inadequate buildings an annual rental of \$16,900 is paid.

Notwithstanding the lack of armor facilities, the National Guard of the District of Columbia has kept up a force which has worked diligently to conform to the requirements of the War Department at a very great sacrifice on the part of the officers and men, who have devoted their time and energy and, in many instances, money to promoting the welfare of the organization and bringing it to a point where it could be considered as efficient.

Since 1887 about 33,000 individuals, officers and men, have served in this organization. The training which they have received in some instances has been thorough and others not, but all of them received some instruction which would be valuable in the event that the United States was forced to call for a large force of volunteers. The value of this military training may be very great to the country in time of stress.

At the outbreak of the Spanish War the entire National Guard volunteered, and one regiment was permitted to enter the service. It served creditably in Cuba, and was present in the trenches when Santiago surrendered. The Member of Congress, Hon. L. C. Dyma, who introduced the bill under consideration, served in this regiment. In addition to this regiment, it furnished officers and men to some of the so-called "immune" regiments and to the United States Volunteer Engineers,

and during the Philippine insurrection it furnished many officers and men to the United States Volunteers organized for service in the Philippines.

At the present time there are more than 25 officers in the United States Army, serving there creditably, who received early military training in the District of Columbia National Guard. One of them has been awarded the congressional medal of honor for distinguished gallantry and two of them have been selected to captain the Army Infantry team in the great rifle competitions.

Past duty well done, as well as future activity in the training of citizens to defend the flag in time of national danger, justifies the expenditure for a complete armory in the District of Columbia—one which will adequately provide for this brigade of troops and serve as a model to the State organizations.

Statement of rent paid for armories, etc., District of Columbia National Guard.

Armory 472 L Street NW., including the use of the drill hall three nights in each week from Oct. 1 to May 30.....	\$10,000
Armory 251 First Street.....	3,900
Armory 1200 U Street.....	1,200
Quarters for noncommissioned officers of the Army detailed as instructor sergeants.....	1,020
Stables for horses for mounted organization, 458-460 Virginia Avenue.....	780

16,900

If the United States is to rely in large part upon the militia; if the militia of the several States is to be maintained and trained to the standard of efficiency which the military authorities of the United States deem necessary; if, as experience has shown, adequate armories are an absolute necessity in that maintenance and training, it would seem the part of wisdom on the part of the Federal Government to supply its own Organized Militia in the District of Columbia, which is within the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress, with an armory which will be a model in every way and which can stand as an object lesson to the many State national guardsmen who visit the National Capital, that they may take home with them ideas as to what is desirable in armory construction.

The National Guard of the District of Columbia is a Federal force organized by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1889 (25 Stat. L., 772), as amended by the act of February 18, 1909 (35 Stat. L., 629). It differs from the State militia in that it is directly under the command of the President of the United States all the time.

The Constitution provides:

"The President shall be the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States."

As will appear below, the President of the United States is the Commander in Chief of the National Guard of the District of Columbia, just as he is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 27. That the provision of the act of Congress approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat., 873), which authorizes the demolition of the present Federal building and the construction of a new post office and courthouse upon the site thereof at Madison, Wis., at a limit of cost of \$550,000, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury further, in his discretion, to sell the present post office and courthouse and the site thereof in said city to the highest bidder, at public or private sale, in such manner and upon such terms as he may deem for the best interests of the United States, to convey said property to the purchaser thereof by the usual quitclaim deed and to deposit the proceeds of such sale in the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt: *Provided, however,* That if such sale is made before the completion and occupancy of the new Federal building hereinafter authorized, the agreement of sale shall reserve to the United States the right to continue to occupy said present Federal building property free of rent for not exceeding three years from the date of such sale.

That if the Secretary of the Treasury elects so to sell the present Federal building property, he is hereby further authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a suitable site in said city and to contract for the erection and completion thereon of a suitable building, including fireproof vaults mechanical equipment, and approaches, complete, for the use and accommodation of the post office, United States courts, and other governmental offices in said city, at a cost for said new site and building of not exceeding \$550,000.

That if the Secretary of the Treasury elects so to sell said present Federal building property, the appropriations of \$200,000 and \$15,000 made by the act of Congress approved March 3, 1915 (38 Stat., 825), for the demolition of the present Federal building and commencement of a new building on the site thereof and for temporary quarters and moving expenses, be, and the same are hereby, made available for the acquisition of such new site and the commencement of the erection thereon of the new building authorized in the next preceding paragraph hereof.

That if a new building is erected on the present Federal building site, the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, may disregard the provision requiring 40 feet open space for fire protection.

Mr. CLARE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 49, section 27, strike out the entire section, beginning in line 16, down to and including line 13, on page 51.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered for the reason that the provision included in that paragraph is already law. It was passed in September as a separate bill. Therefore there is no necessity for it in this bill, and I move to strike out the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the chairman of the committee to strike out the section.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand that the motion is to strike out the first paragraph of section 27?



Mr. CLARK of Florida. To strike out the entire section.

Mr. STAFFORD. May we have the amendment reported again?

The amendment was again read.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment as a new section 27.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 51, after line 13, insert the following as a separate section:

"SEC. 27. That the so-called Army Building and the site thereof, at the corner of Robert and Second Streets, in St. Paul, Minn., are hereby transferred to the custody and control of the Treasury Department; that the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to remodel, enlarge, rearrange, repair, and improve said property as may be necessary for the accommodation and convenience of the business of the United States, at a cost not exceeding \$50,000; and the Secretary shall assign space in said building to such offices of the War Department and other branches of the public service as he deems requisite for the proper transaction of the public business."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman kindly make some explanation of that amendment? It is a new item.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, on account of the condition of my throat I will ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VAN DYKE] to make a statement concerning this amendment.

Mr. VAN DYKE. Mr. Chairman, by this amendment it is proposed to relieve the congested condition of the Federal building in the city of St. Paul. Some time ago the city of St. Paul deeded to the War Department a parcel of land on Robert Street near Second, for the purpose of erecting a building to house the Quartermaster's Department for the Department of the Northwest. About three years ago the Quartermaster's Department was removed to the city of Chicago, leaving this building vacant, and it has been vacant ever since. The congested condition of the Federal building in the city of St. Paul renders it necessary to make some provision in order to carry on the business of the Government, and instead of asking for a new building we thought it would be better to transfer the title from the War Department to the Treasury Department, or to have the War Department transfer the custody of this building to the Treasury Department, and ask for a slight appropriation in order to remodel the building, so that we could not only take care of the incoming and outgoing mails of the city, but also use certain floors of the building for offices for the War Department and other departments, to house their agents in the city of St. Paul.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has this proposal the approval of the War Department?

Mr. VAN DYKE. It has the approval of both the War Department and the Treasury Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I should like, in my time, to have the Clerk read a little classical poem which may or may not refer to the bill in question.

The Clerk read as follows:

From *The Romany Rye*, the following quotation concerning "Poisoning the Porker," or, as rendered in the Gypsy language, "Drabbing the Baulo," may be in order:

"Listen to me, ye Roman lads who are seated in the straw about the fire, and I will tell how we poison the porker—I will tell how we poison the porker."

"We go to the house of the poison monger, where we buy 3 pennies' worth of bane, and when we return to our people we say, 'We will poison the porker; we will try and poison the porker.'"

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to object to this. It is not a discussion of the bill or of any amendment pending. I make the point of order against the further reading of that document, because it does not refer to the bill and is not germane to anything in it. Enough of it has been read to show that fact.

Mr. KENT. I ask leave to print the remainder of it in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing the remainder of it in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am going to object to that. I do not want this bill all mixed up with a lot of stuff like that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida objects.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 51, between lines 13 and 14, amend by inserting a new section, to be designated as section 27½, to read as follows:

"SEC. 27½. That section 26 of the public-building act approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stats. L., p. 886), which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into a contract or contracts for the erection of fire-proof laboratories for the Bureau of Mines in the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., etc., and the act of Congress approved December 22, 1913 (38 Stats. L., p. 251), which amends said section 26, be, and the same are hereby, amended so as to increase the limit of cost therein fixed from \$500,000 to \$550,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment, section 27½, offered by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 28. That the provision of the act of Congress, approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stats., p. 872), authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to contract for the erection and completion of a suitable building for the post office and other governmental offices at Syracuse, N. Y., be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to increase the limit of cost for said building from \$550,000 to \$800,000, and to authorize the provision of accommodations for the United States courts and the installation of mail-handling apparatus to facilitate the postal business of said building, and that the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, after the completion of the said building at Syracuse, N. Y., and after public advertisement, to sell the old post-office building and the site thereof at such time and upon such terms as he may deem for the best interests of the United States, and to convey said property to the purchasers thereof by the usual quitclaim deed, and to deposit the proceeds in the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt: *Provided, however*, That the said old post-office building and site shall not be sold for less than \$250,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 52, line 3, after the word "sell," insert the following: "at public or private sale, but at not less than the value as determined by an appraisal thereof by the Secretary of the Treasury."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. There is no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record with reference to the McNeil Island item.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Amend, page 52, by inserting between lines 10 and 11 a new section to be designated as section 28½, to read as follows:

"SEC. 28½. The act approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stats., p. 740), providing for a new building for an assay office in New York City be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to increase the limit of cost therein fixed from \$607,408 to \$807,408."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this is an increase of \$200,000 for authorization of the assay office in New York City. I think there ought to be some explanation given by some member of the committee.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, a gentleman representing the Treasury Department and the Director of the Mint several days ago were before the committee and made a showing of the very dangerous condition at the assay office, where sums of money are being kept without any adequate means of storage. They insisted that the emergency was so great that immediate action ought to be taken to report an emergency bill. I think every member of the committee who heard the statement was of the opinion that it was hazardous to keep the money of the Government in that condition at this time. Some of it was out in the hall and they had to have extra guards for the purpose of taking care of the money.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. Certainly.

Mr. LANGLEY. The hazard was so great with reference to the keeping of the public funds that the committee thought it ought not to print all that was said in the hearings.

Mr. BURNETT. Yes; the hazard was so great that the details were not printed by the committee. We thought they ought not to be printed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I recall now that the condition the gentleman has called my attention to was brought to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations, and I know there is pressing need for new vaults for the Government to make provision for the enormous increase in gold from Europe.



Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Alabama. Has the contract been let for this building, or what is the status?

Mr. BURNETT. They advertised for bids, but no bids could be secured under the limit.

Mr. WINGO. Does this proposition contemplate the enlargement of the building that is authorized?

Mr. BURNETT. No; it does not. They will necessarily have to use a good deal of steel, and the price of steel has increased to such an extent that the building can not be constructed within the limit of cost.

Mr. WINGO. I do not recall whether it was an item of this kind, but some time since I have been a Member of the House I recall that there was a proposition to increase the appropriation \$200,000 in order to provide a more beautiful front for a building in New York. What building was that?

Mr. BURNETT. There is nothing of the kind here; this is absolutely for the protection of the increased influx of gold.

Mr. WINGO. What size building does the department contemplate building?

Mr. BURNETT. I do not remember the details. I do not think it is to be enlarged; it is to build the building that was originally contemplated.

Mr. WINGO. Does the Government own the ground upon which it is proposed to erect the building?

Mr. LANGLEY. As I recall it, the Government does own the land. As the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] has stated, this extra appropriation is needed to complete the building under the plans originally formed because the original appropriation was not sufficient to construct the building owing to the increased price of material.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman says the Government does own the land?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. What size of building is it proposed to erect?

Mr. SUMNERS. As I understand, the building is to be six or seven stories high.

Mr. WINGO. Is it to be a new building?

Mr. SUMNERS. It is to be a new building. As stated by the gentleman from Alabama, the Government is now unable to erect the contemplated building because of the advance in the price of steel. It was stated to our committee that about 80 per cent of the cost of the material for the entire building will be for steel, and, as the gentleman knows, the price of steel has greatly advanced, that explains the necessity for the increase in the appropriation.

Mr. WINGO. How many millions constitute the maximum of gold that office has ever had?

Mr. SUMNERS. The gentleman will permit me to continue the statement—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, the urgent necessity, as has been explained by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT], arises from the fact that they are compelled to handle an unprecedented quantity of gold coming to the United States from causes which the gentleman well understands.

Mr. WINGO. That is the reason I am asking the question. What is the greatest volume they have to take care of in their vaults?

Mr. SUMNERS. It runs up into hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. LANGLEY. Six hundred million dollars at one time.

Mr. SUMNERS. Yes; over half a billion of dollars.

Mr. WINGO. Let us say it is \$832,000,000. What sized vault would it take to hold that much gold?

Mr. SUMNERS. The gentleman is going into details that I would have to submit to the architect; but I will state this to the gentleman: A condition was brought to the attention of this committee, such that I do not believe the gentleman would even ask us to state—

Mr. WINGO. I know what the gentleman is referring to; but the situation with reference to sufficient vault room to take care of some \$800,000,000 dollars of gold in a six-story building is such that I would like to know why it is necessary to spend the \$200,000 more on a six-story building, and why it is necessary to build a six-story building to take care of that much gold.

Mr. SUMNERS. I do not believe that the building is to be used entirely as a vault.

Mr. LANGLEY. Not by any means.

Mr. SUMNERS. There are employees of the Government who will handle this gold, who will be housed in this building.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman knows that this increased volume of gold is unprecedented and it is not supposed to last very long. The plans we now have will take that gold away from there and put it into the vaults of the Federal reserve banks.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Since the consideration of the items in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill providing for the maintenance of Subtreasuries, it has been called to our attention the Federal reserve banks have no provision whatsoever for the deposit of Government funds such as bullion and gold.

Mr. WINGO. Has any one of the Federal reserve banks at any time asked that the Federal Government provide it with a building at public expense?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no. The Federal reserve banks, as is pointed out in a letter written by the Secretary of the Treasury, are private banks, and are totally apart from any governmental function.

Mr. WINGO. That is what I say. This building could not possibly be erected in time to meet the present emergency on account of the extraordinary volume of gold.

Mr. SUMNERS. I direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that this is the building authorized a long time ago.

Mr. WINGO. Authorized two years ago, nearly three years ago, but it has not yet been started.

Mr. SUMNERS. When conditions were normal.

Mr. WINGO. And it will take, as the gentleman knows, two or three years to erect a Government building of that size. Is not this \$200,000 item intended solely for purposes of construction to be used on what they call the façade?

Mr. SUMNERS. Not at all. My recollection is that this building is to be constructed behind the other which the Government now occupies. Every statement made before this committee bore directly upon the necessity arising out of the increased price of material, steel especially, which makes up some eighty-odd per cent of the cost of the building which it is contemplated to have erected on the lot now owned by the Government.

Mr. WINGO. It is thought it will take \$200,000 additional to provide for the additional vault room for \$800,000,000 of gold.

Mr. SUMNERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WINGO. But the gentleman of the committee has no statistics as to the size of the vault to hold that much gold.

Mr. SUMNERS. No, sir. I will say to the gentleman that the committee was convinced this expenditure is necessary, and not only necessary but urgently necessary.

Mr. BURNETT. I will state to the gentleman what I have already stated, that I would have been better informed in regard to the matter, but it was insisted it was an emergency matter, and since then I have not refreshed my recollection.

Mr. WINGO. It is a well-known fact that the Federal Reserve Board not only asked, but the governor appeared before our committee to-day, asking—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If the gentleman will permit, unless this authorization is made it is utterly impossible to go to the construction of the building at all. Now, the superintendent of the mint and the custodian over there, the gentleman in charge of this, were before our committee and they stated distinctly that they had advertised for bids and had not gotten a single bid anywhere within reach of the authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WINGO. The reason for that is plain. They have intended ever since I have been in Congress to get this \$200,000 additional, and that is the reason they did not get an answer to their bid.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, we are getting along pretty well with the bill, and I crave the indulgence of the committee for a moment or two in reference to a matter that is not in this bill, however I wish it were. The original Capitol Building, as we all know, did not include the wings now occupied as the House and Senate Chambers with various offices connected with them, but the original Capitol Building, including the original Senate Chamber, is now in part occupied by the Supreme Court of the United States. Everybody who has anything whatever to do with the Supreme Court, or made any investigation relating to the Supreme Court, has known that the quarters which they have are very scant and insufficient. There was a suggestion made some years ago to construct a Department of Justice building, or a Supreme Court building, on the square north of the



Library of Congress, but it was understood at that time, unofficially, that the members of the Supreme Court did not desire that the Supreme Court should leave the Capitol Building itself, and I honor them for that opinion. I think it adds to the dignity of the country that the Supreme Court of the United States be located in the Capitol Building of the United States. It is quite feasible, however, to enlarge the quarters of the Supreme Court building by extending the old Capitol Building front easterly to meet the line of the two wings of the Capitol. There is not a single item in this bill, in my opinion, that is of as much importance as to do that one thing, and I am sorry that is not in the bill. I am calling attention to it in the hope, it probably having never been called to the attention of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, that that committee will investigate somewhat in reference to the matter.

The members of the Supreme Court of the United States can not go lobbying. They can not permit one of their employees to go lobbying. It is beneath their dignity, properly so, to even make a representation in reference to the matter. I had occasion some years ago to look into the matter somewhat—possibly I have been negligent since—when we provided for the House Office Building and the distribution of rooms there and elsewhere. Members of the Supreme Court now are so fixed that it is impossible for them to have ready access to the books which they are using all the time. A man on the Supreme Court of the United States, studying the law cases, ought to be able to reach at his elbow almost for a book, ought to be able to get it without difficulty, ought to be able to have sufficient quarters to carry on his business in the Capitol of the country. Far better for them and for us that they do their work in chambers in the main or where the other justices are than to do what they have been required to do, do most of their work at their own homes without sufficient library facilities. [Applause.]

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment. I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is not necessary; it is a committee amendment, and all you have to do is to vote it down.

Mr. WINGO. That is right; it is a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee amendment is still pending.

Mr. WINGO. And that amendment provides for \$200,000 additional for the assay office?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I believe that something ought to be said to show the practice of those who are charged with the duty of administering the laws providing for the expenditure of public funds.

Some years ago the Secretary of the Treasury called attention to the fact that adequate safeguards did not exist for the enormous deposits of gold in the city of New York, which were unavoidable in the transaction of the public business, and proposed a plan to build storage vaults under the Assay Office Building, most of which would be below the water line, and thus impossible of penetration by tunneling or subterranean methods. An appropriation was made for that purpose. Subsequently it was ascertained that an additional sum would be required to do the work, and that money was voted.

It was then decided that the building itself should be remodeled, and a request was made for legislation enabling that to be done, and also for authority to employ the services of engineers who were skilled in construction work involving excavations below the foundations of the very tall buildings which had to be supported, and that was done. And after all the money was appropriated and all of the authority asked for was granted, some one proposed that the Assay Office be sold and a new site acquired and a new building erected, because some one complained that the fumes from the Assay Office were offensive to the tenants of some particular office building. Instead of proceeding with the work of providing for the accommodations for the security of the gold of the United States, several years were frittered away in the idle attempt to have Congress gratify the whim of some new official who thought he had discovered something advantageous or different. The result is that in the corridors of the Assay Office in New York, piled in heaps like bags of grain, are boxes of gold bullion and coin, with no place to store them, no place to put them, but piled there like stone heaps in the public streets. In the meantime, with all of this dillydallying and suggesting and frittering away of time, the work that could have been done and completed if begun promptly and at the time it should have been commenced, can not now be done within several hundred thousand dollars of the original estimated cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have five minutes more, because it is a very interesting statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And so, Mr. Chairman, as the result of this method of transacting the public business, if this work is to be carried out it involves an expenditure of several hundred thousand dollars that could have been avoided. I am inclined to believe that it is not too much to expect that when Congress has provided for a great emergency for the safeguarding of the gold which is in the Treasury the officials charged with the duty should have been keen to have executed the law and to have properly safeguarded the gold. I do not know what can be done about the situation. There are not adequate facilities there at present. This gold can not be properly stored. I am not apprehensive of any very serious attempt being made to loot the Treasury or the Assay Office in New York, but reasonable precautions should be taken to safeguard such an enormous fortune. It is enough to tempt the cupidity of the most daring crooks that exist in the country. Yet because of the failure of certain officials to perform their public duties and discharge important public duties, the people are saddled with an additional expense of \$200,000.

It is not a thing that concerns the city of New York. Whether provision be made properly to care for this gold or not there will always be a very enormous quantity of gold in the city of New York, because there international balances are settled. I do not intend to vote for this bill, so whatever happens to this amendment will not go to affect my position. I am opposed to the bill, and it is immaterial to me what happens to the amendment.

I did not take the floor for the purpose of discussing the merits of the amendment, but I thought the committee was entitled to information which explains the necessity for the proposed amendment. The work could have been practically finished within the original appropriations and an unnecessary expenditure of \$200,000 avoided if those whose duty it was to do the work had complied with the law and performed their duty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I want just three minutes. The statement of the gentleman is very interesting, and it emphasizes the contention which we have been making all this time that there has been criminal negligence and delay not only in this particular case but in dozens and perhaps hundreds of other cases, and therefore emphasizes the necessity for passing this measure which proposes to take the administration of these affairs out of the hands of those who have delayed them so long, and put it in the hands of somebody whom we hope will administer them with more judgment than those who have been administering them heretofore. The gentleman is absolutely correct in the statement that the principal necessity for this additional expenditure of \$200,000 is on account of the increased price of the steel that is necessary to construct those buildings, which could have been obviated if the men having those matters in charge had performed their duty, and performed it some time ago, as they should have done.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment, to be designated as section 28½.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. WINGO. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 95, noes 6.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent now to turn to page 14, lines 16 and 17, to the Oakland, Cal., item, in order to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to return to page 14, lines 16 and 17.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, let the amendment be read. I reserve the right to object.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Strike out lines 16 and 17, on page 14, and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to contract for the acquisition, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of a new site, and for the erection and completion thereon of a suitable building, including fireproof vaults, mechanical equipment, and approaches, complete, together with such mail-handling apparatus, etc., as he may deem advisable, for the use and accommodation of the post office and other governmental offices at Oakland, Cal., at a cost of not exceeding \$1,000,000.

"And that the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, upon the completion and occupancy of said new building, to sell the present public building and the site thereof in Oakland, Cal., at public or private sale, but at not less than the value as determined by an appraisal thereof by the Secretary of the Treasury, and at such time and upon such terms as he may deem advisable, to convey such property to the purchaser thereof by the usual quitclaim deed, and to deposit the proceeds of said sale in the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt."



Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, there is no limitation placed on the amount at which this property can be sold, is there?

The CHAIRMAN. There is no limitation.

Mr. MADDEN. There ought to be. It will not do to simply state that the Secretary of the Treasury can sell it at any price he thinks proper. If it is worth anything, they ought to know what it is worth.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I assume they would sell it for the appraised value, and they would get the appraisement in the authorized way and would be bound by that appraisement as a minimum.

Mr. MADDEN. There ought to be a minimum stated in the provision. It should be stated that it should not be sold at less than a certain amount.

Mr. ELSTON. Is not the gentleman from Illinois satisfied with the provision that the Secretary of the Treasury shall make an appraisement and that the property shall not be sold at less than the appraisement?

Mr. MADDEN. No. I want a limitation here that the appraisement shall not be less than a certain amount. It is either worth that amount or not worth that amount. Nobody knows whether this property is going to be given away or sold. The minimum figure ought to be stated at which it would be sold. That is what has been done in other cases, and there ought not to be an exception made in this case.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. The original amount is \$650,000. Why not put the minimum amount that it is to be sold for as the difference between \$650,000 and the amount you have named in the amendment?

Mr. ELSTON. I have no doubt but that the property can be sold for more than that figure, but if you intrust this matter to the Secretary of the Treasury and prescribe that he shall sell it at not less than a fair appraisement to be made under authority of law, I do not believe you will get anything less than the real value for the property. That is the usual procedure, so far as my memory goes now, that has been pursued in the case of any of these items where the authority has been given to sell an old site. I do not remember that an upset price was fixed.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Who is to make this appraisement?

Mr. ELSTON. The Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. And the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized by this to sell it at private sale, so that the appraiser appraises it at what he thinks it is worth and that will be the price?

Mr. ELSTON. If it is sold at private sale the amount realized must be at least its appraised value.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The man that sells it can sell it at private sale for what he thinks it is worth. Does the gentleman think that any executive officer should take hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of property belonging to this Government and sell it at private sale on any terms he pleases?

Mr. ELSTON. The Secretary of the Treasury, I am informed, will appoint an appraiser or appraisers who will appraise the property carefully, and there will be no authority to sell for less than such appraisement. It seems to me that is a safe procedure under which to sell Government property.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Is the gentleman certain that the appraisers will fix the value at which the property will be sold? How does he know? Has the gentleman any idea of what the property is worth?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MADDEN. What is it worth?

Mr. ELSTON. I believe the property is worth anywhere from \$300,000 to \$400,000, according to the market.

Mr. MADDEN. That is a good deal of a margin.

Mr. ELSTON. I believe a fair value would be at least \$350,000, but I would not be willing to see a clause put in here limiting the sale price to a figure above that amount, because that would be putting a special clause in here with regard to this proposition that has been put in with respect to other similar items.

Mr. MADDEN. It was put in the item with respect to Pittsburgh. I do not see why an exception should be made here.

Mr. ELSTON. In the Pittsburgh case the Government purchased the site many years ago for \$941,000. There might be some reason in that case to put an upset price of \$941,000 so that the Government would at least get back the money invested.

In the case of Oakland the price paid for the original site and building combined was only \$250,000. Now, I am told that the site alone is worth \$350,000. The gentleman will take note of this important fact: Additional ground was purchased in 1913, for which \$153,000 was paid, to enlarge the present site. I would not want to fix a minimum sale price and have it inserted in the bill, thereby prejudicing this proposition. I do not think that would be advisable in view of the appraisement clause carried in my amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman says that recently \$153,000 were expended for the purchase of additional property to enlarge the present site?

Mr. ELSTON. That is correct.

Mr. MADDEN. Now the gentleman comes in with a proposition to sell the property for which \$153,000 was recently paid, and also the property it was intended to enlarge, and the building which stands upon the property that was originally purchased, and to purchase a new site. What special interest is involved in the case that requires the purchase of a new site?

Mr. ELSTON. The Secretary of the Treasury personally visited this site within the last two months. He made a reconnaissance of the whole situation, and when he returned to Washington he addressed a letter to the Speaker of the House—House Document No. 1776, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session—in which he recommended that the present site be sold, notwithstanding his previous recommendation, upon which the item went into the bill appropriating a certain amount to put a new building on the present site. His letter to the Speaker sets forth in detail the valid reasons for the proposed change.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELSTON. I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ELSTON. The Secretary of the Treasury gives very cogent reasons why the proposed amendment which I have offered, in the very words suggested by the Secretary of the Treasury himself, should be adopted. This is not a proposition of my own. It was recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury and with the approval of the principal interests of the city of Oakland itself. So if the gentleman feels that there is some kind of a joker, I will advise that this is an absolutely bona fide proposition, and the Government probably will save about \$50,000 on the whole transaction; because it is my belief, although I am not willing to put such a limitation into the bill, that the present site will bring \$500,000 after the lapse of time necessary for the completion of the new building. Oakland now has a population of nearly 250,000 and is increasing at the rate of about 25,000 a year. The postal receipts within the last quarter indicate an increase of over \$50,000 during the present year, which will make a total of over \$650,000 for this fiscal year.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Treasury visited California only a few months ago, as I understand the gentleman from California [Mr. ELSTON] to say. While he was there he was waited upon by a number of business men of the city of Oakland, who urged upon him the necessity of abandoning the present site, the purchase of which he recommended only a short time before, and he recommended the sale of that site in order that a new site might be purchased. He not only recommended the abandonment of the site the purchase of which he recommended, but also the abandonment of the building; and when the property is sold, if it is sold according to the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury, every man here knows that the building will be given away.

Mr. ELSTON. Will the gentleman yield just a moment?

Mr. MADDEN. Surely.

Mr. ELSTON. Under the present appropriation of \$650,000 it is contemplated that the present building will be demolished, so that in either case the Government will lose the value of the improvement now on the property.

Now, I will state to the gentleman that the whole investment of the Government in the building and site is \$250,000.

Mr. MADDEN. And \$153,000 of that was only invested a short time ago.

Mr. ELSTON. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I meant \$250,000 was the original investment, and \$153,000 is to be added to it.

Mr. MADDEN. That makes \$403,000. The Secretary of the Treasury and the business men of Oakland only a short time since thought the present site was all right for this public building. If the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treas-



ury to the effect that the present site was good is worth anything, then his present recommendation that it is no good is worth nothing. I submit that the House ought not to be trifled with in any such way as this amendment proposes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Have we not some regular system of disposing of old buildings and property that there is no longer use for?

Mr. MADDEN. I am not talking about the disposition of the property, I am talking about encouraging the purchase of property to-day on the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury, and then on the recommendation of the same Secretary of the Treasury, sell the property to-morrow.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Has that been the practice heretofore?

Mr. MADDEN. No.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Why do not we follow the usual practice?

Mr. MADDEN. The practice in this case is to let the site purchased on the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury stand and put the new building upon it. Who knows what we will have to pay for a new site; who knows what we will be able to get a new site for? Who knows how much money this will cost in the end? Who knows the interests behind the sale of this property? Who knows what interest is behind the purchase of new property? I am not willing as one Member of the House to act upon a question of this sort in any such slipshod manner.

Mr. ELSTON. Does the gentleman mean to intimate that the new site will cost \$450,000?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know; if I knew anything about it I would not be here on my feet. Nobody is able to tell anything about it. If the recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury has no more stability than these recommendations, they ought not to be acted upon.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this site was provided for—

Mr. MADDEN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have the floor and the gentleman can not take me off my feet.

Mr. MADDEN. I simply wanted to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I was on my feet, but waiting for the Chairman to get order. I simply want to say that the provision for the purchase of this land was made in 1913, four years ago, and the provision which is offered here is the same provision which the gentleman from Wisconsin offered for various other items providing for the appraisal of the property, and the Secretary of the Treasury can not sell it for any less than its appraised value. Now, we have to trust somebody. Congress can not tell exactly what every piece of property all over the country is worth, and we have to leave it to the discretion of some one. The gentleman from Wisconsin offered these amendments, and I think they were wise and discreet.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman from Florida state to the House that he thinks that it is wise to sell property recently purchased in Oakland and buy a new piece of property?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The purchase of the property was authorized under the act of 1913. I do not know when it was bought, but that was when it was provided for. It was then thought that an addition to the old building would be sufficient. But the city has grown to such an enormous extent, and conditions there are such as to make it advisable, instead of enlarging that building, to sell the old property and buy a new site and put up a new building.

Mr. MADDEN. It is proposed to put up a new building in any event, is it not?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. It is now; yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Even though you use the old site?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Absolutely.

Mr. MADDEN. Why not use the old site and put the new building on it?

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, in 1906, at the time of the earthquake and fire at San Francisco, Oakland was a city of 60,000 inhabitants. After the disaster a great many of the citizens of San Francisco moved to Oakland and remained there. To-day, 10 years after that event, it is a city of nearly 250,000 inhabitants, and the business center of the city has changed. The city has expanded and is growing rapidly and constantly. This post-office site is no longer desirable. That is the reason for this proposition. You all know that when a city grows rapidly not only does it expand but the business center frequently changes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KAHN. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. When was this addition to the present site purchased?

Mr. KAHN. I do not think it is more than two or three years ago.

Mr. MADDEN. It is a good deal less than 10 years ago, is it not?

Mr. KAHN. The city has been growing by leaps and bounds.

Mr. MADDEN. It must have been considered a good site two years ago?

Mr. KAHN. No; it was considered a good site four years ago.

Mr. MADDEN. This was purchased less than two years ago.

Mr. KAHN. I think it was purchased in 1913.

Mr. MADDEN. No; it was authorized in that year.

Mr. KAHN. It was purchased—

Mr. MADDEN. It was purchased about two years afterwards. If it was considered a good site in 1915 it ought still to be considered a good site, or the men who made the purchase ought to be reprimanded for making such a purchase.

Mr. KAHN. I have seen the business center of Oakland change twice within 14 or 15 years. The principal street 15 years ago is no longer the principal street.

Mr. SUMNERS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS. Is it not a fact that the old site, the present site, is not within free delivery distance of the railroad station? I understand that to be the fact—that it is more than 80 rods.

Mr. ELSTON. It is a mile.

Mr. SUMNERS. That perhaps is one of the main things that influenced the Treasury Department in determining on a change.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. May I ask the gentleman if, as the gentleman says, the population has increased enormously in 10 years, which is a matter of common knowledge, and a site was purchased and advantageously located two years ago, or last year, and the city is growing by leaps and bounds, had not we better wait a few years and see if it will not bound back to the place where it started?

Mr. KAHN. In the meantime we want accommodations for the people who are there, and the present site does not give them that service which they require.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman certainly does not expect to buy a new site every year?

Mr. KAHN. Oh, no; and the gentleman does not intend that they should purchase a new site every year. But the gentleman feels that a proper building at a proper place ought to be provided to do the Government's business.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the committee.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 15, lines 19 and 20, for the purpose of offering an amendment, which I ask to have read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to return to page 15, for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, let the amendment be first reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, lines 19 and 20, after the words "post office," in line 19, insert "land office," and in line 20 strike out "\$55,000" and insert "\$65,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Now, Mr. Chairman, on page 36 of the bill there is a matter in reference to Porto Rico, about which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] inquired. There was something said about the sale of the warehouse property at Porto Rico. I did not have the letter of the Secretary at that time, but I now have it and I will send it up and ask to have the Clerk read it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the letter in the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, June 7, 1918.

The SPEAKER,  
House of Representatives.

SIR: The Treasury Department is the custodian of the United States warehouse site at San Juan, P. R., which property the collector of customs at that port states is not needed for governmental purposes, as the present Federal building, reservation and Government buildings are sufficient to take care of the needs of the Government for a great many years to come.



The title to this land is disputed by the present occupant, the Porto Rico Railway, Light & Power Co., and proceedings have been instituted to enforce the Government's rights. The company mentioned has offered to purchase the land, but the department was obliged to reply that there was no authority of law for such a sale.

It is recommended that authority be given by proper legislation for the sale of said property in such manner and upon such terms as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem to be for the best interests of the United States.

A draft of the desired legislation is inclosed.

Respectfully,

W. G. McAdoo, *Secretary*.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Now, Mr. Chairman, I may state further, I am now informed that the Governor of Porto Rico is opposed to the sale of this property and the Secretary of War is also opposed to it, and therefore I am going to ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment to strike section 10 from the bill. I offer the amendment to strike section 10 from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 36, beginning in line 17, strike out all of section 10.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to section 21, page 46, in order to give the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GARLAND] an opportunity to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to return to section 21. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARLAND: Page 46, line 27, at the end of the paragraph, insert:

"If the Secretary finds that it is more feasible to buy additional land for a site for a post office adjacent to or near the present post-office building, he is hereby authorized to acquire such additional land by purchase or condemnation, and in that event the sum secured from said sale is hereby authorized to apply for the acquisition of said additional land."

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARLAND. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think there should be some limit of cost placed on the amount to be expended for the site to be purchased. Under this authorization the Secretary of the Treasury will be permitted to obligate the Government in any amount and utilize the fund that would arise from the sale of the property now owned by the Government as part payment under that purchase.

Mr. BURNETT. If the gentleman will permit me, I hardly think that that would be so. The only authorization for a site in this bill is from the proceeds from the sale of that site, and it would take a new authorization.

Mr. STAFFORD. The wording of the amendment is not limited in the way indicated by the gentleman from Alabama. I ask unanimous consent to have the amendment again read.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I think certainly under that authorization the Secretary of the Treasury would have the right to purchase any tract of land, no matter what the price would be, and obligate the Government in an untold amount. There should be a limit of cost on the amount that may be expended for a site and a limit of cost not to exceed a certain amount.

Mr. BURNETT. I think the gentleman's conclusions are wrong, because there is no authorization except for the purchase of a site.

Mr. STAFFORD. After the word "condemnation" insert "at a limit of cost not to exceed the proceeds arising from the sale."

Mr. BURNETT. That is all right. How could he be authorized unless we give him the authorization?

Mr. STAFFORD. Is that satisfactory to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GARLAND. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modified amendment offered by Mr. GARLAND: Page 46, at the end of line 27, insert as a new paragraph the following:

"If the Secretary finds that it is more feasible to buy additional land for a site for a post office, adjacent to or near the present post-office building, he is hereby authorized to acquire such additional land by purchase or condemnation, at a limit of cost not to exceed the proceeds arising from said sale, and in that event the sum secured from said sale is hereby authorized to apply for the acquisition of said additional land."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, I only want to say in behalf of the amendment that it was simply to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to use this money that he would secure from the sale of the lot as provided in section 21.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 29. That the Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury be, and the same is hereby, abolished, and that there be, and hereby is, established in the Treasury Department a bureau to be designated and known as the bureau of public buildings. There shall be at the head of the bureau of public buildings an officer who shall be designated and known as the commissioner of public buildings, who, in addition to being a skilled architect, shall be a man of good business and executive ability, and he shall receive an annual salary of \$7,500, to be paid monthly.

The commissioner of public buildings shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. He shall be appointed for a term of four years, and before entering upon the discharge of the duties of his office he shall take and subscribe an oath in the same form as that required of other Government officials.

The commissioner of public buildings immediately upon entering upon the duties of his office shall proceed to organize the bureau of public buildings into an active body for the expeditious and economical drafting of plans and construction of such public buildings of the United States as have been or which may hereafter be authorized by the Congress of the United States, and to this end he may use any or all of the officers and employees now connected with the Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury and prescribe the services to be rendered and the duties to be performed by each, as well as to designate the official title of each such officer or employee.

The bureau of public buildings shall be controlled and directed by a committee of three persons, the commissioner of public buildings to be chairman and the remaining two members to be appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury from the force of the said bureau of public buildings.

The bureau of public buildings shall have jurisdiction over and control of the selection of all such sites for public buildings as have been or may be authorized by Congress, the drafting of plans and specifications for all public buildings which may be authorized by Congress, the supervision of the construction of all public buildings authorized by Congress, and in fact jurisdiction over and control of the entire matter of the construction of all Federal buildings until the same shall have been completed. And the said bureau shall have the custody, care, and maintenance of all completed Federal buildings throughout the United States: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall apply to buildings for the Military or Naval Establishments.

The commissioner of public buildings shall divide the States and Territories of the United States into not less than 6 nor more than 12 groups, in such manner as to have States and Territories of similar topography and climate as near as may be in the same group, and shall designate them by letter, beginning with the letter A. He shall likewise divide the towns and cities of each group which contain no Federal activity other than the post office into classes, as follows: All towns and cities in which the postal receipts for the preceding fiscal year amounted to not less than \$10,000 nor more than \$25,000 shall be placed in one class; all those where such receipts amounted to not less than \$25,000 nor more than \$40,000 shall be placed in another class; all those where such receipts were not less than \$40,000 nor more than \$75,000 shall be placed in another class; all those where such receipts were not less than \$75,000 nor more than \$150,000 shall be placed in another class; and all those with over \$150,000 of such receipts shall be placed in another class, which classes shall be designated as Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, respectively.

After the States and Territories shall have been divided into groups, and such cities and towns shall have been divided into classes as aforesaid, it shall be the duty of the commissioner of public buildings to standardize all public buildings authorized for any of the cities and towns included in such classes; that is to say, that whenever plans and specifications are drawn for a building to be constructed at a city or town included in any of the classes stated, such plans and specifications shall be used for buildings which may be authorized at other cities or towns of the same group and in the same class.

The commissioner of public buildings shall organize for each group of States and Territories herein provided for a field force of inspectors and other employees, who shall have the immediate supervision of all building construction in such group, and the custody, care, and maintenance of all public buildings within such group, under such rules and regulations as said commissioner of public buildings, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe. The Secretary of the Treasury shall appoint, upon the recommendation of the commissioner of public buildings, one person as chief inspector for each group, who shall have his office at some central place within such group, to be designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, and said Secretary of the Treasury shall also appoint, upon the recommendation of the commissioner of public buildings, such other officers and employees as in his judgment may be necessary in each of such groups for the expeditious performance of the duties herein required.

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to fix the compensation of each and every officer and employee included in the organization plan of the bureau of public buildings as arranged by the commissioner of public buildings, and to report the same in full detail to the Congress at its next session for ratification, amendment, or rejection.

That each chief inspector of each of the groups of States and Territories herein provided for shall immediately upon entering upon the duties of his office proceed to ascertain the facts and, as soon as is possible, make a report to the commissioner of public buildings, in which he shall, by States and Territories, set forth the number of public buildings in each such State or Territory; the total cost of each building; the Federal activities housed in each building; the number of employees housed in each building, and the branch of the service in which each is employed; the date when each of such buildings was first occupied; additions, if any, which have been placed on each of such buildings, and additions to sites, the cost, and when made; the present condition of each of such buildings with reference to repairs and the necessity for repairs; the necessity, if any, as to enlargement; the name and salary of each employee who is employed to care for each of such buildings; and such other facts as may pertain thereto. And the



commissioner of public buildings shall forward all of such reports to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall submit the same to Congress at its next succeeding session. And thereafter similar reports shall be submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury to the first session of each Congress.

In the purchase of sites for Federal building of any character, it shall be the duty of the bureau of public buildings in each and every case to provide for the purchase of sufficient lands so that the said building can be enlarged from time to time as the needs of the service and the Federal activities of the Government at the particular place may require, and that the Secretary of the Treasury, in the manner as now provided by law, shall purchase such sites as may be so selected by the bureau of public buildings.

That the bureau of public buildings shall require of owners or agents of sites in each case where a site is proposed to be purchased and where sites or additions to sites are proposed to be purchased, to submit offers of sale in writing, and in case the site or the addition to a site which it is proposed to acquire contains a building or buildings, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, upon the recommendation of the bureau of public buildings, to rent until their removal becomes necessary such of said buildings as may be purchased by the Government of the land upon which the same may be located, where the buildings are reserved by the vendors at a fair rental value, the proceeds thereof to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt, and a report of the proceedings to be submitted to Congress annually.

That in the purchase of sites for Federal buildings of any character, the bureau of public buildings shall be left free to select such sites without reference as to whether they are bounded upon more than one side by streets or alleys and are permitted, in their discretion, to select inside lots or sites for such purposes.

That proposals for the sale of land suitable for all sites or additions to sites, respectively, shall be invited by public advertisement in one of the newspapers of largest circulation of the cities involved for at least 20 days prior to the date specified in said advertisement for the opening of said proposals. Proposals made in response to said advertisement shall be mailed and addressed to the commissioner of public buildings, Treasury Department, Washington, D. C., who shall then cause the said proposed sites or additions to sites, as the case may be, and said other obtainable sites as would be suitable, to be examined in person by and through the field force having jurisdiction of the territory involved, and when such examination shall have been completed the chief inspector of the field force in such group shall make a written report to the said commissioner of public buildings of the results of said examination, and of his recommendation thereon and the reasons therefor, which shall be accompanied by the original proposals and all maps, plats, and statements which shall have come into his possession relating to the said proposed sites.

In each case when a public building shall be authorized by Congress, the commissioner of public buildings shall submit to each department which is to have employees housed therein, if Federal activities other than the post office and the civil service are to be accommodated, tentative plans thereof for such suggestions as to space as such department or departments may desire to make: *Provided*, That no department shall retain such plans for more than five days, and in no event shall the approval of such plans by any department be necessary before proceeding with the construction of such building.

The commissioner of public buildings in all advertisements for bids for the construction of public buildings authorized by Congress shall ask for at least three separate bids, involving the use of three different kinds of materials, and one of these shall involve the use of local material, should there be suitable building material for such purpose within the State or Territory.

In the construction of Federal buildings at cities or towns where there are no Federal activities other than the post office and the civil service to be housed, it shall be the duty of the Bureau of Public Buildings to construct in all such cases a factory or block type of building in such manner that the same may be added to and enlarged as the needs of the Government may require.

There shall be in the bureau of public buildings a board of estimates, consisting of three persons, two of whom shall be designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, and the third member shall be the commissioner of public buildings, who shall be the chairman of said board. It shall be the duty of such board of estimates, immediately upon the introduction of a bill in Congress proposing to purchase a site or to construct a Federal building, or both, to institute an investigation, through the field force in the proper group of States and Territories, or otherwise, and, as early as possible, report to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall at once forward the same to the committee of Congress having jurisdiction of the bill the following facts:

- First. The postal receipts for the last fiscal year.
- Second. The different Federal activities to be provided for.
- Third. The number of employees for each Federal activity to be housed.
- Fourth. The population according to the last Federal census and the preceding one.
- Fifth. The estimated population at time of making the report.
- Sixth. What important industries, if any, are located in or adjacent to the town or city.
- Seventh. How many railroads.
- Eighth. Whether county seat or not.
- Ninth. Character of public and business buildings.
- Tenth. What municipal improvements.
- Eleventh. Present needs as to space and probable needs within 10 years.

Twelfth. Character of rented quarters occupied by the Government at time of making report.

Thirteenth. Amount of rent being paid annually in the town or city by the Government at time of making report.

Fourteenth. Distance of post office from union station or depot of railroad to which bulk of mail is brought at time of making report.

Fifteenth. Amount being paid annually by the Government for carriage of mail to and fro between depots and wharves and post office at time of making report.

Sixteenth. Any further fact or facts showing or tending to show advisability of providing for a Federal building at the place named in the bill.

That from and after the passage of this act no city or town in the United States where there are no Federal activities other than the post office shall be considered, either for the purchase of a site or for the construction of a Federal building, by the commissioner of public buildings or the bureau of public buildings or by any committee of

Congress, unless it shall appear that the postal receipts for such city or town have amounted to at least \$10,000 annually for three successive years: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall apply to cities or towns where sites for public buildings have been acquired or authorized.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: At the end of line 7, on page 54, add the following:

"*Provided further*, That the Bureau of Public Buildings in the construction work herein or hereafter authorized is hereby directed to give precedence to those authorizations most urgently needed by the Postal Service."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman let me get through with this first? I offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Amend, on page 61, line 3, by striking out all of line 3 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "First. The postal receipts for the past three fiscal years."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That is to go at the end of the bill as a separate section.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill insert as a separate section the following: "No janitor shall be employed for any Federal building in which a post office is located where the postal receipts do not exceed \$20,000 per annum unless a Federal court be located in such building."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: Page 52, line 20, after the word "of," strike out "\$7,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,000."

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the Supervising Architect of the Treasury now receives a \$5,000 salary per annum. Is that correct? I will ask the chairman of the committee. At any rate, that is the fact as I understand it. I ask the chairman of the committee is it not a fact that the Supervising Architect receives a \$5,000 salary per annum?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I think so.

Mr. MADDEN. He gets \$6,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I think he gets \$6,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Five thousand dollars is the salary named in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. All right; no matter what it is, he is not worth \$3,000.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. The committee probably considered this question, but it seems to me that this salary named here is really excessive. The assistant secretaries in the various departments receive but \$5,000 per annum. Most of the commissioners receive but \$4,000, and if we fix the salary of the head man here at \$7,500 that will fix the standard for the salaries of all those under him. I think the general tendency of this Congress is to fix salaries too high. That is all I have to say on the subject.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say this, that the amount of salary is a matter of judgment. The architects of this country make a great deal more money than that. You can not get a man who is a first-class man to take that place for \$5,000 or \$6,000. I question whether you would be able to get him for \$7,500.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. In a moment. The committee discussed fixing it at \$10,000. For myself I would be perfectly willing to pay \$20,000 a year to a good man who would go into that office and do the work that ought to be done. He can save



his salary a dozen times over in the course of a year, because if we get the right man—and we have attempted here to get not only a good architect but a good business man—if we can get that kind of a combination the Government could well afford to pay him \$50,000 a year and save these enormous fees that are paid out to outside architects who work upon these great buildings. I hope that the amendment of the gentleman will not be agreed to.

Mr. VARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Certainly.

Mr. VARE. I want to ask the gentleman whether this does not eliminate entirely the question of fees?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, absolutely. He gets a salary and nothing else.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the chairman of the committee. My judgment is that a good architect should be paid, \$10,000 a year, and not \$7,500.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I think it is somewhat regrettable that a prolonged and rather vain discussion of the various items in the bill consumed so much time, and left the committee in such a condition of impatience of mind that we cannot have a discussion of this very important section of this bill. This section is not only very important, but in the main wise. But it has many provisions, a number of which it seems to me are questionable; and in just the moment that I shall take I want to call the attention of the committee, and particularly the chairman of the committee, to one or two features of the legislation.

The first paragraph of this section abolishes the Office of the Supervising Architect and establishes the bureau of public buildings. The next paragraph provides that after the commissioner of public buildings has been appointed he may continue under his jurisdiction the employees of the Supervising Architect's Office; but let me suggest to the chairman, in order that he may give the matter his attention before this legislation becomes a law, that as the matter now stands, if I correctly interpret the language, there would be a period of time between the time when the Office of the Supervising Architect is abolished and the new official is appointed, takes the oath of office and organizes his office, during which the force of the Supervising Architect's Office would be legislated out of employment, and there should be a brief amendment providing for the continuation of the employment of the force in the Supervising Architect's Office until such time as the new office is established and the force employed under the new plan. It seems to me that is rather important.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Has the gentleman prepared such an amendment?

Mr. MONDELL. I have not prepared such an amendment, because I have not been certain until very recently as to the situation.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Does not the gentleman think they would continue anyhow without that express provision? Does not the gentleman think they would continue to perform their functions until the new commissioner took hold?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not; I am told that former proposed legislation along this same line did contain a provision under which this force was continued in office or continued in employment until they went under the supervision of the new official. This bill goes to another body, and will be considered there, and I am sure the chairman of the committee will have this matter in mind.

In the meantime I want to call attention to some language in the middle of the paragraph on page 60, providing for public buildings in small towns, the effect of the provision being that in such towns the Government shall build factory or block types of buildings, and expand and enlarge them as the needs of the Government increase. In my opinion that is exceedingly objectionable legislation. If we are to build public buildings we ought to build public buildings that we will be proud of. The Federal Government ought not to start on a policy of building cheap and flimsy buildings anywhere. If we build a factory or block type of building, they should only be built in places where the business of the Government is purely of a commercial character. The post-office business is not that sort of business. The post offices are built generally on the main street, and they should be of a character that will compare favorably with the best buildings in the town or the city. They ought not to be cheap or flimsy. The Government ought to build a good building that we can be proud of, or it ought not to build at all. I realize that at this late hour we can not secure consideration of an amendment, hence I will not offer one, but this para-

graph ought to be amended as well as a number of paragraphs of this section. As matters now stand we must depend on the Senate to give this legislation proper attention.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 62, line 17, strike out the words "or authorized."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of calling the attention of the committee to what I regard as a very important matter. The chairman of the committee having charge of the bill stated that this last paragraph did not apply to the provisions contained in the bill. With all deference to the chairman and his ability to construe the law which he drew, I can not agree with him. I believe the provisions of the last paragraph apply to projects contained in the bill. I have not offered the amendment to do away with that construction, but rather to strengthen it, because I prefer to see that construction maintained. The last paragraph provides that "from and after the passage of this act" certain things shall be done. Let us see what effect this has upon the projects contained in the bill. This section provides, in the first instance, for the creation of a bureau of public buildings. After having provided for the creation of a bureau, it provides in this section that from and after the passage of this act no place shall be selected as a site for a post office unless the annual receipts amount to \$10,000. That is as explicit as it can be. "From and after the passage of this act" means immediately on the passage of this act. That is the construction which ought to be put upon it and one which will be put upon it, and any officer who undertakes to put any other construction upon it will do it at his peril.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill is construed according to the plain meaning of the language of this last paragraph, there is no room for proper criticism upon it. Only towns with post-office receipts amounting to \$10,000 are to have a post-office building, and I am not prepared to say that under no circumstances should one having receipts somewhat less be provided with a building. The average citizen of a country town can not come to Washington. He can not see these great buildings upon which money has been spent without stint for architectural display. He can not pass through the Congressional Library and see the beautiful paintings, its bronze statuary, and its wealth of decorations in marble and mosaic. He gets no benefit from the millions that have been spent to beautify the buildings in this and other great cities of the Nation.

He only knows the Government as an intangible something, and the only time he comes into contact with it is when he goes to his post office, a dingy, dirty, ill-kept building, where his wife and daughters are crowded and jammed for want of space in the waiting lobby, and where he often has to wait two hours for the distribution of his mail because of inadequate facilities for its distribution. In the large towns the citizen has his mail brought to his door. In the small towns he goes after it, and usually pays the Government annually as box rent—the box being as much for the convenience of the Government as his own—more than the box costs. He quite properly feels that he is not being treated fairly or justly under such conditions. It is no answer to say that the big cities furnish the larger portion of the post-office receipts. They do; but while this is paid in the first instance by the large business houses which do a business with the country at large, it is all charged up as a part of the running expenses, added to the price of the goods, and in the final instance always paid by the country consumer.

The cost of these buildings ought to be greatly reduced. I do not know where the fault is, but I do know that I have never seen a post-office building yet when an equally useful and far more ornamental building would not have been built by private parties for less than two-thirds its cost. This bill undertakes to put a stop to this waste in the future, and I hope it will.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] will put a stop to the waste in janitors' fees which has heretofore been prevailing, and thereby obviate one of the strongest objections to the bill. This bill is by far the best general public-buildings bill that has ever been presented to Congress. It restricts expenditures, will reduce the cost of building, and will permit those localities which do not have sufficient receipts at this time to obtain buildings when they have shown \$10,000 post-office receipts for a period of three years. Its provisions will be misrepresented by a sensational press, but when completely understood it will receive no criticism except from those who want all of the money spent in the large cities and wish to deny to rural communities conveniences to which they are entitled.



It is said with reference to some of these projects that it would be cheaper to rent than build new buildings, even after the janitors' fees are limited. This may be true; but we do not construct these buildings entirely for profit. If we did, we never would build libraries, for they do not pay. We would seldom build a courthouse, for we could rent some old shed cheaper. Nor, applying the same principle, would we ever put any money into parks, which are a total loss from this standpoint; nor as individuals, even when possessed of ample means, would we construct anything for a house more than a mere shelter. Under this same theory the noble monument which we are erecting to Lincoln, and which is to cost several millions of dollars, is merely graft or pork on the part of this city.

It is said that in any event that this bill ought not to pass at this time on account of the condition of the Treasury. I admit that the condition of the Treasury is serious, but this issue is a false one. There is not a man on this floor that does not know that nothing will be spent on the projects in this bill for three years, except in the emergency-cases in the big cities and buying sites to prevent an advance in price. Nothing whatever can possibly be spent in the next year, and what is spent after that in the next two years will be in urgent cases for the big cities. Four years ago I obtained the passage of a bill for the erection of a public building in a town of my district. The contract is not yet let, and it will be probably another year before much is paid out on it.

Mr. Chairman, even if a different construction should be placed on the language of this bill from that which is plainly the meaning of its words, and thereby some projects be authorized which at present have too small post-office receipts to be entitled thereto, they are all growing towns, and by the time the contracts are ready to be let they will have reached the limit which is certainly prescribed for the future, if not for the present. The amendment which I have offered would put beyond all question the application of the \$10,000 limit to the projects in this bill. If it should be rejected and thereby an improper construction put upon the terms of the bill, the fault is not mine, and I do not feel that I am required to vote against the bill for that reason. All but about \$5,000,000 authorized goes to the large cities. One per cent of the amount carried by the bill would take care of every project in the bill where the receipts are less than \$10,000 annually, and even those cases will probably reach that amount before construction.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 54, line 7, after the word "establishments" strike out the period and insert a comma and the words "or to the Capitol Building, Senate Office Building, or the House Office Building."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, that amendment is due to the fact that in the first two lines of page 54, especially line 5, it says "and the maintenance of all completed Federal buildings throughout the United States." The Capitol, the Senate Office Building, and the House Office Building are Federal buildings, and if so their care and maintenance will be given to this board.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. We have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why not add the White House?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I will modify my amendment by adding the White House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman modifying the amendment?

There was no objection.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not want to detain the House, as it is evidently anxious and ready to vote. Anything I may say will not change a vote, and I am not going to make any effort to change a vote. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that you can not make types of building by law. It will be impossible to do it. Legislation that is here proposed will be futile. It will cost more money to build the foundation of a building in one place than it will to complete the whole building in another place. What is the use of talking about types? You can not divide the country into sections in which certain types of buildings will be employed. The material in one section of the country will cost four times as much as for the same building in another section of the country. If Bedford stone is specified to be used in a building in San Francisco, the cost of the freight alone will amount to more than the building

will cost if material is used which is on the ground where it is produced.

So, here we are endeavoring by legislation to regulate a condition that can not be regulated. It seems to me absurd, and I think some one ought to go on record as saying that this is not possible to be obtained through the bill which is here proposed.

We are spending, if this money is all appropriated in this bill alone, \$40,000,000, and we are creating a bureau that will have control over the expenditure of all the money in the future expended for public buildings. We are endeavoring by legislation to instruct the bureau that we are creating as to the type of building that will be erected in any given section of the Union. It can not be done. If you say the type is to be of a certain value or cost, that is one thing; but to build a certain type of building in one section of the country and the same type in another section of the country are two different propositions, because in the one case the same type may cost four times as much as in the other case. [Applause.]

So, why complicate the situation by placing upon the records of Congress a statute instructing those who are empowered to construct the buildings to do a thing which is impossible for them to do? [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to move to strike out, for the sake of grammar, without taking any time, the word "which," in line 8, on page 53. I call this to the attention of the committee; if they do not care to do so, well and good.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 8, strike out the word "which."

Mr. CRAMTON. Also, in line 13, the same page, the word "to."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the additional amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 13, strike out the word "to."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. There is no objection to the amendments.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill do pass. [Applause.]

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CLINE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 18994 and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The question was taken and the amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio withdraws his point of no quorum and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

#### LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leaves of absence were granted as follows:

To Mr. HULBERT, for three legislative days, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. LOBECK, for a week, on account of illness.

To Mr. CONRY, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

#### LATE ADMIRAL GEORGE DEWEY.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a minute.

Members will undoubtedly go home during the roll call, and I think we ought to have some understanding now under unani-



mous consent so that all Members will be informed in regard to the program for to-morrow.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman permit me to make one statement? I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that on account of the ceremonies in the Capitol to-morrow the trip to Monticello has been postponed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I understand—

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I shall ask the House that when they adjourn to-day they adjourn to meet at 10.45 to-morrow morning, in order to attend the ceremonies at 11 o'clock in the rotunda. After that I shall move to adjourn over until Monday.

Mr. MANN. So that Members may understand, I wish to say that my understanding is that the House as a House—

Mr. KITCHIN. Without taking a recess at all.

Mr. MANN (continuing). With the Speaker will march over to the rotunda, without tickets.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. So that Members will not have tickets, but they should be here.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I just had notice from one of my clerks that the tickets of admission to the building, even for Members, were at the post office.

Mr. KITCHIN. There will be no tickets to Members. The Members will go over in a body and return here after the ceremony.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Evidently what the gentleman refers to is that the Capitol is to be closed to-morrow, and nobody will be admitted except Members and those having tickets of admission. The employees of the House and others who are employed in the Capitol are furnished tickets of admission by the Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. LANGLEY. Are there no tickets for other employees?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] as to the distribution of these tickets. What about the families of Members?

Mr. KITCHIN. No tickets have been issued to Members.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I mean, to outside people—the families of Members.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The only persons who will attend the funeral, I understand, are those who have been invited to the rotunda, and those invited include the two Houses of Congress, the Diplomatic Corps, naval officers, and certain friends and relatives of the deceased. I understand there are no provisions for any public admissions.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is right.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that all Members understand that owing to the limited space in the rotunda Members will not have tickets to distribute to individuals. Members themselves will not require tickets. I think the tickets referred to are probably automobile tickets to get into the grounds, or something of that kind.

Mr. KITCHIN. And for the employees of the Capitol here.

Mr. MANN. And for the employees.

Mr. KITCHIN. It is not the understanding that the Members of the House will have to have tickets to the Capitol.

Mr. MANN. The Members of the House do not.

The SPEAKER. If the gentlemen will permit, the Speaker will state what a member of the House committee told him after investigation and inquiry. He said the space was so limited that they set aside a sufficient number of seats for the House Members and for the Members of the Senate. They gave so many tickets to the President. They assigned so many of them to Mrs. Dewey, and she sent back word she wanted some more, and they gave her the others. They set aside 150 places for naval officers, and they have arranged for the Cabinet, and that exhausts the seating capacity. Your people might get in and stand around the wall. The Sergeant at Arms got up a ticket to give to the employees of the House, so that they could get into the building. The Members of Congress do not have to have any tickets in order to get into the Capitol.

#### HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 10.45 a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 10.45 a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of this public-buildings bill—H. R. 18994—will, as their names are called, answer "yea," and those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 234, nays 92, answered "present" 2, not voting 106, as follows:

#### YEAS—234.

Abercrombie	Dyer	Konop	Sears
Adamson	Eagan	Kreider	Shackelford
Aiken	Eagle	Langley	Shallenberger
Alexander	Elston	Lazaro	Sherwood
Almon	Emerson	Lee	Sims
Aswell	Estopinal	Lehlbach	Sinnott
Austin	Farr	Lesher	Sisson
Ayres	Ferris	Lever	Slemp
Bacharach	Fields	Lieb	Sloan
Bailey	Focht	Linthicum	Small
Barkley	Fordney	Littlepage	Smith, Idaho
Bell	Fuller	Lloyd	Smith, Mich.
Black	Gallagher	London	Smith, Minn.
Blackmon	Gallivan	McAndrews	Smith, Tex.
Borland	Garland	McCracken	Snell
Bowers	Gould	McDermott	Snyder
Browne	Gray, Ala.	McKellar	Sparkman
Browning	Green, Iowa	McLaughlin	Steagall
Bruckner	Gregg	McLemore	Steele, Iowa
Brumbaugh	Griest	Magee	Steenerson
Buchanan, Ill.	Guernsey	Martin	Stephens, Nebr.
Buchanan, Tex.	Hadley	Matthews	Sterling
Burke	Hamilton, Mich.	Meeker	Stone
Burnett	Hamlin	Miller, Minn.	Stout
Butler	Harrison, Miss.	Miller, Pa.	Sulloway
Byrnes, S. C.	Hart	Mondell	Summers
Caldwell	Hastings	Montague	Sutherland
Candler, Miss.	Haugen	Moon	Swift
Caraway	Hawley	Moore, Pa.	Switzer
Carter, Okla.	Hayden	Morgan, Okla.	Tague
Cary	Hayes	Mott	Taylor, Ark.
Charles	Heaton	Mudd	Taylor, Colo.
Church	Helgesen	Murray	Thomas
Clark, Fla.	Helm	Neely	Thompson
Cline	Helvering	Nicholls, S. C.	Timberlake
Collier	Hensley	North	Towner
Connelly	Hernandez	Norton	Van Dyke
Cooper, Ohio	Hilliard	Oldfield	Vare
Cooper, W. Va.	Hollingsworth	Oliver	Venable
Cooper, Wis.	Hood	O'Shaunessy	Vinson
Copley	Hopwood	Overmyer	Volstead
Crago	Houston	Padgett	Walker
Crisp	Howard	Park	Ward
Curry	Howell	Porter	Wason
Dale, N. Y.	Hughes	Powers	Watkins
Dale, Vt.	Hull, Iowa	Price	Watson, Pa.
Danforth	Humphrey, Wash.	Rainey	Watson, Va.
Davenport	Jacoway	Raker	Webb
Decker	Kahn	Ramseyer	Whaley
Denison	Kelley	Randall	Wheeler
Dent	Kennedy, Iowa	Ricketts	Williams, W. E.
Dickinson	Kettner	Riordan	Wilson, Ill.
Dies	Key, Ohio	Rodenberg	Wilson, La.
Dillon	Kiess, Pa.	Rouse	Wingo
Doelling	Kincheloe	Rubey	Woods, Iowa
Doughton	King	Rucker, Ga.	Woodyard
Dupré	Kinkaid	Russell, Mo.	Young, Tex.
	Kitchin	Saunders	

#### NAYS—92.

Allen	Foss	La Follette	Rayburn
Anderson	Foster	Lenroot	Reavis
Anthony	Frear	Lindbergh	Reilly
Ashbrook	Freeman	Longworth	Rogers
Barnhart	Gandy	Loud	Rowe
Byrnes, Tenn.	Gardner	McArthur	Schall
Carter, Mass.	Garrett	McCulloch	Scott, Mich.
Coady	Gillett	McFadden	Sherley
Coleman	Glass	McKenzie	Shouse
Cox	Glynn	Maher	Stafford
Cramton	Good	Mann	Stephens, Tex.
Crosser	Gordon	Miller, Del.	Sweet
Cullop	Gray, Ind.	Moore, Ind.	Tavener
Dallinger	Greene, Vt.	Moss	Temple
Dill	Hicks	Nichols, Mich.	Tilson
Dixon	Huddleston	Nolan	Tinkham
Doollittle	Hull, Tenn.	Page, N. C.	Treadway
Doremus	James	Palge, Mass.	Walsh
Dowell	Johnson, S. Dak.	Parker, N. J.	Williams, T. S.
Ellsworth	Johnson, Wash.	Peters	Williams, Ohio
Esch	Kearns	Platt	Winslow
Fess	Keating	Quin	Wood, Ind.
Fitzgerald	Kelster	Rauch	Young, N. Dak.

#### ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Adair	Oakey
-------	-------

#### NOT VOTING—106.

Barchfeld	Darrow	Gray, N. J.	Kent
Beakes	Davis, Tex.	Greene, Mass.	Lafean
Beales	Dempsey	Griffin	Lewis
Benedict	Dewalt	Hamill	Liebel
Bennet	Driscoll	Hamilton, N. Y.	Lobeck
Booher	Drukker	Hardy	Loft
Britt	Dunn	Haskell	McClintic
Britten	Edmonds	Heflin	McGillicuddy
Burgess	Edwards	Henry	McKinley
Callaway	Evans	Hill	Mapes
Campbell	Fairchild	Hinds	Mays
Cannon	Farley	Holland	Mooney
Cantrill	Finley	Hulbert	Morgan, La.
Capstick	Flood	Humphreys, Miss.	Morin
Carlin	Flynn	Husted	Morrison
Casey	Gard	Hutchinson	Nelson
Chandler, N. Y.	Garner	Igoe	Oglesby
Chipherfield	Godwin, N. C.	Johnson, Ky.	Olney
Conry	Goodwin, Ark.	Jones	Parker, N. Y.
Costello	Graham	Kennedy, R. I.	Patten



Phelan	Rucker, Mo.	Siegel	Taggart
Pou	Russell, Ohio	Slayden	Talbott
Pratt	Sabath	Smith, N. Y.	Tillman
Ragsdale	Sanford	Stedman	Wilson, Fla.
Roberts, Mass.	Scott, Pa.	Steele, Pa.	Wise
Roberts, Nev.	Scully	Stephens, Miss.	
Rowland	Sells	Stiness	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. MORIN (for) with Mr. GRIFFIN (against).  
 Mr. FLOOD (for) with Mr. DUNN (against).  
 Mr. OLNEY (for) with Mr. MAYS (against).  
 Mr. HOLLAND (for) with Mr. SCULLY (against).  
 Mr. TILLMAN (for) with Mr. PATTEN (against).  
 Mr. SELLS (for) with Mr. MAPES (against).  
 Mr. WISE (for) with Mr. SIEGEL (against).  
 Mr. FLYNN (for) with Mr. HASKELL (against).  
 Mr. MEEKER (for) with Mr. REAVIS (against).  
 Mr. DECKER (for) with Mr. CAPSTICK (against).  
 Mr. HILL (for) with Mr. OAKLEY (against).  
 Until further notice:  
 Mr. ADAIR with Mr. BARCHFELD.  
 Mr. IGOE with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.  
 Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. STINESS.  
 Mr. BOOHER with Mr. PRATT.  
 Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. LAFFAN.  
 Mr. GARNER with Mr. CANNON.  
 Mr. TAGGART with Mr. MOONEY.  
 Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi with Mr. NELSON.  
 Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania with Mr. PARKER of New York.  
 Mr. STEDMAN with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.  
 Mr. SABATH with Mr. ROWLAND.  
 Mr. RUCKER of Missouri with Mr. RUSSELL of Ohio.  
 Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. POU with Mr. SANFORD.  
 Mr. PHELAN with Mr. BEALES.  
 Mr. OGLESBY with Mr. BENNET.  
 Mr. MCCLINTIC with Mr. BENEDICT.  
 Mr. LOFT with Mr. BRITT.  
 Mr. LOBECK with Mr. BRITTEN.  
 Mr. LIEBEL with Mr. CAMPBELL.  
 Mr. CARLIN with Mr. MCKINLEY.  
 Mr. HULBERT with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.  
 Mr. HENRY with Mr. CHIPERFIELD.  
 Mr. CONRY with Mr. HUTCHINSON.  
 Mr. HEPLIN with Mr. COSTELLO.  
 Mr. HARDY with Mr. DARROW.  
 Mr. DEWALT with Mr. HUSTED.  
 Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. HINDS.  
 Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas with Mr. DEMPSEY.  
 Mr. EVANS with Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. DRUKKER.  
 Mr. GARD with Mr. EDMONDS.  
 Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi with Mr. GRAHAM.  
 Mr. BEAKES with Mr. FAIRCHILD.  
 Mr. OAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no." I am paired with my colleague, Mr. HILL. I want to change my vote from "no" to "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. OAKLEY, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. CLARK of Florida, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask that my colleague Mr. MAPES be excused from attendance, on account of serious sickness in his family.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

#### RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 20079, the river and harbor bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 20079, the river and harbor bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINY] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 20079, the river and harbor bill, with Mr. RAINY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 20079, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20079) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAINY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 20079) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the order previously made, until to-morrow, Saturday, January 20, 1917, at 10 o'clock and 45 minutes a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting a detailed statement of the number of documents received and the number distributed by the Department of Labor during the calendar year 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1948); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting schedules and lists of papers, documents, etc., on the files of this department which are not needed in the transaction of public business and have no permanent value or historical interest (H. Doc. No. 1949); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, inviting attention to specific details in acts of Congress which restrict operations of the War Department, and submitting tentative drafts of provisions to cure their defects (H. Doc. No. 1950); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of F. Sidney Wade and Cathryn H. Morris, children and sole heirs of Sidney B. Wade, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1951); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Susan J. Hugill, widow of Asa S. Hugill, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1952); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Maggie F. Lancaster, widow (remarried) of Thomas T. Fisher, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1953); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Helen Ayers, widow of Amos T. Ayers, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1954); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.



8. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Phillip T. Barth, son of George W. Barth, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1955); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Albert R. Neal, son and sole heir of Lucius W. Neal, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1956); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Henry S. Beldler *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1957); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

11. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Anna Blanch, widow of Willie Blanch, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1958); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

12. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Josephine Glover, daughter and sole heir of Frank T. Foster deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1959); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

13. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Elizabeth J. Riley, Imogen Stewart, and Eva J. Graham, children and sole heirs of Toland Jones, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1960); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

14. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Sanford D. Payne *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1961); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

15. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Jacob M. Harlem, administrator of Alfred Dale Owen, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1962); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

16. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of John H. Purves *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1963); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

17. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Flora B. Tenney, widow of William Tenney, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1964); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

18. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Sarah P. Tyrer, widow of Theodore Tyrer, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1965); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

19. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Frank M. Vowels *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1966); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

20. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Joshua T. C. Welborn *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1967); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

21. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Sarah F. Campbell, widow of Calvin D. Campbell, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1968); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

22. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Robert E. Walpole, brother and sole heir of Horace H. Walpole, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1969); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19785) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant extension of time for making payments on land in Cheyenne and Arapahoe Indian Reservations, in the State of Oklahoma, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1324), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND: A bill (H. R. 20291) to further amend an act approved August 13, 1894, entitled "An act for the protection of persons furnishing materials and labor for the construction of public works," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 20292) to provide for the appointment of a commission to standardize screw-thread tolerances; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 20293) to provide for the establishment of a uniform sales-of-goods act for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 20294) authorizing receipts from the sale of surplus power to be applied to the payment of operation and maintenance charges on reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 20295) making appropriations for airships and other aerial machines and accessories for use in connection with the seacoast defenses of the United States and the Philippine and Hawaiian Islands; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 20296) to amend section 858 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 20297) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Beltrami, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in said county; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 20298) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate condemned cannons and balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING: Resolution (H. Res. 458) requesting the President of the United States to furnish the House with information; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. McLEMORE: Resolution (H. Res. 459) requesting the Department of State to instruct all consuls in Belgium to report on what happened in their respective districts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Resolution (H. Res. 460) to print 2,000 additional copies of the reconnaissance soil survey of northeastern Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Printing.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 20299) granting a pension to George Parliament; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 20300) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 20301) granting a pension to Martin V. Stover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20302) granting a pension to William M. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 20303) granting an increase of pension to Alice Yorker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 20304) granting an increase of pension to George T. Harwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 20305) granting a pension to George Wyszneuckas; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DILLON: A bill (H. R. 20306) granting an increase of pension to Nancy L. Mason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 20307) granting a pension to William McBride; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 20308) granting a pension to Lee Monroe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20309) granting a pension to Orville C. Bolt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20310) granting a pension to Theodore Lange; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 20311) to authorize the President to appoint Second Lieut. Ambrose I. Moriarity, retired, to the grade of lieutenant colonel in the United States Army and place him on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.



By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 20312) granting a pension to William H. Klipp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 20313) granting an increase of pension to John O. Branson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20314) granting an increase of pension to Isaac C. Spears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 20315) granting an increase of pension to James Little; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASKELL: A bill (H. R. 20316) granting an increase of pension to Frances Getchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 20317) granting an increase of pension to A. E. Holloway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 20318) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Haxton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 20319) for the relief of W. H. Baldwin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20320) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20321) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Weston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 20322) granting an increase of pension to Edward G. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY: A bill (H. R. 20323) granting a pension to Mrs. Winfield S. Fisk, Flint, Mich.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 20324) granting a pension to Ambrose R. Kinley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 20325) granting a pension to Hoyl N. Higdon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOONEY: A bill (H. R. 20326) granting an increase of pension to George Clay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20327) granting a pension to Matilda Cass Lipps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 20328) granting a pension to Fred A. Schultz; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 20329) granting a pension to George W. Shrader; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20330) granting a pension to William L. Snider; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 20331) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Christy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 20332) granting an increase of pension to George W. Morton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 20333) granting an increase of pension to Perry B. Glines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 20334) granting a pension to Thomas F. Dolan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 20335) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Walters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20336) granting an increase of pension to John Coats; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 20337) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Sanders; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 20338) granting an increase of pension to Eugene B. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 20339) to grant a gold medal to Burlington Cunningham for conspicuous bravery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 20340) granting an increase of pension to Joseph F. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 20341) granting an increase of pension to Bennett M. Tracy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 20342) granting a pension to James A. Annas; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20343) granting a pension to Clara D. Peterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: A bill (H. R. 20344) for the relief of George W. Thompson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARY: Petition of citizens of Milwaukee, protesting against any prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLEMAN: Petitions of Union Gospel Church, of Wilkesburg; Homewood United Presbyterian Church, 860 members, of Pittsburgh; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 40 people, of Pittsburgh; Homewood Avenue Presbyterian Church, 1,400 people, of Pittsburgh; and 600 people of Christian Church, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 56 citizens of city of Pittsburgh, in favor of District and national prohibition and Federal censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of Consumers' League of New York State, indorsing the Carey bill; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor.

By Mr. DUNN: Petition of Roy F. Conderman, of East Rochester, N. Y., asking for the favorable consideration of a bill to fix the compensation of mail carriers upon an equitable and specific basis; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Ernest Landberg and 11 others, of Rochester, N. Y., protesting against the passage of House bill 18986, Senate bills 4429 and 1082, House joint resolution 84, and House bill 17850; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of citizens of Rochester, N. Y., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 18986, Senate bills 4429 and 1082, House joint resolution 84, and House bill 17850; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of W. M. Taylor and 19 other members of C. J. Dickerson Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Hillsdale, Mich., favoring House bill 18531, concerning proof of widowhood in pension cases; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Painters' Union No. 275, of Chicago, Ill., opposing House bill 18986 and Senate bill 4429, to exclude certain advertisements from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Advance, Chicago, Ill., against the zone system and increase of rates for second-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of T. J. Nertney, of Ottawa, Ill., opposing a prohibitory amendment to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Manufacturers and Dealers' Association of America, against prohibitory legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of sundry railroad employees, opposing House bill 19730; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of board of directors of Taunton Chamber of Commerce, in re remedial interstate traffic regulations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of 360 citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, in opposition to certain prohibition measures now pending before Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY of New Jersey: Petition of Junior Order of American Mechanics, Hackensack, N. J., in re legislation affecting immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi: Protest of citizens of Gulfport, Miss., and vicinity, against the high cost of living, and petition to Congress to place an embargo on the exportation of foodstuffs from the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of citizens of Atascadero, Cal., to press House bill 264; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: Petition of 50 Presbyterian Church people of Taiban; 75 people of Melrose; 100 Presbyterian Church people of Melrose; 50 Presbyterian Church people of Fort Sumner; St. John's Methodist Episcopal Church, of Santa Fe; 30 people of Methodist Episcopal Church and Sunday School of Fort Sumner; and 20 Women's Missionary Union people of Fort Sumner, all in the State of New Mexico, for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL: Memorial of Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Order of Railroad Conductors, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and Brotherhood of Firemen and Enginemen, of New Haven, Conn., protesting against the passage of House bill 19730; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.



By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Resolutions from Newberry Sunday School, Christ Church Sunday School, Lycoming Presbyterian Church, St. Matthew's Lutheran Christian Endeavor Society, Gray Epworth League, and United Evangelical Church, all of Williamsport, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petitions of sundry individuals, opposing universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Cigarmakers' Local Union, No. 1, of Baltimore, Md., opposing prohibitory legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of National Association of Builders' Exchanges of the United States, favoring passage of Clark bill, providing for a bureau of public buildings; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McLEMORE: Petition of sundry citizens of Texas, protesting against the passage of certain bills now before Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: Petitions of post-office employees, for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Men's Adult Bible Class, 40 people, of Rouseville; Woman's Home Missionary Society, 160 people, of Oil City, south; 150 Woman's Christian Temperance Union people, of Oil City, south; 1,000 people of Methodist Episcopal Church of Franklin; Christian Endeavor Society, 155 people, of Franklin; Church of God Woman's Missionary Society, of Franklin; Woman's Club, 95 people, of Franklin; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 235 people, of Franklin, all in the State of Pennsylvania, for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of United Evangelical Church, 550 people, of Franklin; Woman's Relief Corps, 61 people, of Franklin; Federation Woman's Missionary Society of Oil City; 91 Woman's Christian Temperance Union people, of Rouseville; 200 people of Mercer; 402 people of Mercer; 150 members of Presbyterian congregation of Mercer; 250 people of Presbyterian and Methodist Episcopal Churches of Clark; 300 people of Greenville; 400 people of Methodist Church of Mercer; and 300 Presbyterian people of Jackson Center, all in the State of Pennsylvania, for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: Memorial of Thomas J. Clark Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON: A petition of sundry Federal employees stationed at Madison, Wis., asking that Federal employees outside the District of Columbia also be included in the extension of the annual leave and Saturday half-holiday privileges; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. NOLAN: Resolutions by Dried Fruit Association of California, San Francisco, Cal., indorsing Secretary of Agriculture's recommendation for legislation standardizing food products and appropriation of funds therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OLNEY: Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OVERMYER: Memorial of Central Huron County (Ohio) Farmers' Institute, of North Fairfield, Ohio, favoring the submission of the question of national prohibition to the several States for ratification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petitions of 372 people of Calvary Baptist Bible School, of Pasadena; Methodist Episcopal Aid Society, 100 people, of Alhambra; 82 people of Pasadena; Methodist Episcopal Woman's Home Missionary Society, 400 people, of Pasadena; 55 people of Pasadena; Lincoln Avenue Methodist Episcopal Epworth League, of Pasadena; Pasadena Board of Labor; Christian Missionary Alliance, 200 people, of Pasadena; and United Presbyterian people of Pasadena, all in the State of California, for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Central Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Pasadena; Home Mission Society of Methodist Episcopal Church, 50 people, of Alhambra; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 50 people, of Alhambra; Epworth League of West Alhambra; Christian Endeavor Society of First Presbyterian Church of Alhambra, all in the State of California, favoring national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of Rev. C. Frank Vreeland and four pastors of churches of Grand Ledge, Mich., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: Petition of 31 citizens of Hillsborough County, Fla., for a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 26 citizens of Hillsborough County, Fla., against increase of postage on periodicals; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STAFFORD: Petition of residents of the fifth district of Wisconsin, protesting against District and national prohibition and mail-exclusion bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Memorial of Association of the American Agricultural College to Congress, protesting against the amendment proposed in Senate bill 4874, known as the land-grant bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of sundry railroad employees, opposing House bill 19730; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WASON: Petition of J. P. Conway, of Plymouth, and 24 other New Hampshire employees in the maintenance-of-way department of American railways, favoring an eight-hour-day law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Frank Herbert, of Rumney, and 12 other New Hampshire employees in the maintenance-of-way department of American railways, favoring an eight-hour-day law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of J. H. Gale, of Warren, and 17 other New Hampshire employees in the maintenance-of-way department of American railways, favoring an eight-hour-day law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE.

SATURDAY, January 20, 1917.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come before Thee at this hour impressed with the solemn thought of death. A prince of Israel has fallen. We are reminded of the ever recurring lesson of Thy Divine providence that in the last issue it is character that wins the glory of life. We pause in the midst of the busy activities of our national life to pay tribute of praise and give some recognition of the fame of this great hero of the sea. We pray for those upon whom his mantle of greatness shall fall, that the high ideals of our Navy, with its spirit of devotion and loyalty and patriotism, may be preserved as a defense of our national honor and the pledge of our national greatness. We pray that as we study the lives of those whom Thou dost bring into the public gaze through deeds of valor we may be enabled to emulate their example and perpetuate among us those high ideals of civil life that have characterized our heroes of the past.

We ask the blessing of God upon our Nation, upon all in authority, upon those who are in places of influence and power, that their outward lives may conform to the dictates of conscience, inspired by the truth of God. For Christ's sake. Amen. The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### HOOR OF MEETING ON MONDAY.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday.

The Vice PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

### LABOR TROUBLES AT EVERETT, WASH.

Mr. JONES. I present resolutions of the Port Commission and of the Central Labor Council of Seattle, Wash., favoring an investigation of the recent industrial troubles at that place.

Mr. President, I desire to state that early in November a very unfortunate occurrence took place in Everett, Wash., resulting in the loss of several lives and the shooting of several persons on account of labor troubles and controversies. I have given it a great deal of study and thought and concluded that there has not been sufficient data presented to warrant a congressional investigation. The matter is also pending in the courts, and I did not desire to do anything that might prejudice one side or the other. So I take this opportunity of making this statement and simply presenting the resolutions. I ask that they may be properly filed and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. I suppose that is the proper committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

### TRADE RELATIONS WITH CHINA.

Mr. JONES presented a petition of the Port Commission of Seattle, Washington, praying for an investigation into the commercial trade opportunities in China and the establishment of trade relations with that country, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.